8.

A RATIONAL DISCOURSE

CONCERNING

TRANSUBSTANTIATION:

IN A

Letter to a Perſon of Honor, from a Maſter of Arts of the Univerſity of *CAMBRIDGE.*

Printed in the Year, MDCLXXVI.

I believe no man will say ye because ye Name of ye first man who worshipped or burnt Incense to the Brazen Serpent is not known, therefore it was not Idolatry so to do; & yet all (or ye chief) ye this Writer insists upon in Proof of Profane: is, ye because ye Person by whom & place where & Year in which it was first maintained, are not recorded, therefore it must be true. —— This is Answer enough to all he has said. ——

MDCCXXXI

A

RATIONAL DISCOURSE

CONCERNING

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

SIR,

HAving lately had the honor of your Company, you were pleaſed to ſignifie a particular difficulty which you had, to believe the great myſtery of Love, and grand ſtumbling block of more ingenious Proteſtants, the myſtery of Tranſubſtantiation; in which, if I could give you ſatisfaction, to my beſt remembrance, you promiſed me to reconcile your ſelf to the Church of *Rome*. *Non ignara mali miſeris ſuccurrere diſco.* My own ſad misfortune to have been Educated in the misbelief of this ſublime Article of our Chriſtian Faith, till the five and twentieth year of my Age, makes me very tenderly compaſſionate both to your ſelf and all others whom I ſee to be involved in the ſame miſery. The all good and all powerful God (who has ſo firmly made me to believe this ſtrange miracle of Love, that had I a thouſand Lives, I would moſt willingly, through God's aſſiſtance, lay them all down to Seal it with my blood) give your Honor, and all Miſbelievers the like ſatisfaction to your and their Eternal comfort. What ſatisfies me, I ſhall in the beſt manner I am able, Candidly propoſe to your mature and impartial conſideration.

Sir, My ſentiment concerning the adorable Euchariſt, is, that it is neither leſs nor more than the Sacred Body and Blood of God; neither leſs nor more than whole Chriſt. God and Man, Soul, Body, and Divinity, though for the love and ſervice of us Sinners, veiled under the vile accidents and appearances of common Bread and ordinary Wine. Concerning which myſtery my firſt Aſſertion ſhall be.

Assertion 1. It is possible to the Omnipotent power of God, to change the substance of Bread and Wine into the substance of our blessed Saviours Body and Blood. And this our Adversaries generally grant. Whence by the way, take notice, that all such Arguments, and most of them are such, as pretend to prove Transubstantiation impossible, even in the judgment of our Adversaries, are Sophisms, and do not prove their Proposers intent: Else they must confess that two Contradictories may be true, and that they can, and do believe them both. To wit, that Transubstantiation is both possible and impossible, and they can, and do believe as much. 'Tis possible that they grant, and 'tis also impossible, for that their Arguments attempt to prove. Further. I prove Transubstantiation possible, thus. What you and I can do, and every day actually do in four and twenty hours, surely God Almighty can do in a moment. But you and I in four and twenty hours turn Bread and Wine into the substance of our bodies, by eating, drinking, and digesting of them. Therefore our B. Saviour in a moment, without eating and drinking, by a mere *Fiat*, or will, that the substance of bread and wine be turned into the substance of his Body and Blood, can effect it. But then you will say, the substance of the bread and wine must be transferred into Heaven, that it may be changed into the substance of our Lord's body there. But why so? Is it not sufficient that the substance of our Lord's body in Heaven, be made to be under the accidents of bread and wine here? But how can the substance of our Saviours body be in Heaven under such a measure of quantity, and such accidents there, and at the same time be here on Earth under a different quantity and accidents? Why, how is the substance of the same Air condens'd under a lesser quantity to day, which rarified yesterday, was under a greater quantity? For the antient and commonly received definition of Rarefaction, is: a little matter under a great quantity; and of Condensation, is, a great deal of matter under a little quantity. For example: In a Weather-glass, the same air rarified, fills twice as much space as did the same air condens'd, as is evident to your eye. So that the same substance of air, when it is rarified, fills the spaces A. and B. which when it was condens'd fill'd only the space A. and this without any addition of any new substance of air, only the same substance by

vertue

No Protestant does.

But then their Form is changed, & nothing like Bread & Wine remains.

vertue of Rarefaction is under a greater quantity than it was before. And will you pawn your ſoul, the Omnipotent God cannot by Conſecration make his own body be preſent to the ſpaces *A* and *B*, which before Conſecration was only preſent to the ſpace *A*. Now who would ever have imagin'd ſuch Doctrin as this concerning Rarefaction and Condenſation ſhould have been taught by an *Ariſtotle* to explicate Nature, and not rather have been invented by ſome Chriſtian Philoſopher, to declare the ſupernaturality of Tranſubſtantiation, ſo aptly does it agree with that hidden and holy myſtery? 2. None make difficulty of a ſpirits being in different places at once. The ſoul is generally acknowledged to be all in the head, and all in the foot: as Almighty God is all in *France*, and all in *England*; not one part of him here, and another there; not one God in *France*, and another in *England*. We indeed, becauſe we never ſaw the ſame thing in two places, but always different things in different places, are apt to imagine it impoſſible for the ſame thing at the ſame time to be in two different places. Hence it follows, whatſoever involves not a contradiction, being poſſible to God Almighty, let our phanſie ſay what it will, we muſt follow our reaſon, and acknowledge Almighty God can make not only a ſpiritual ſubſtance, but even a material one be in two places at once, unleſs we can ſhew it includes a contradiction. To be here, and not to be here, is indeed a contradiction; but to be here and there at the ſame time, is no contradiction; elſe neither our ſoul, nor God Almighty himſelf, could be all here, and all in another place at the ſame time. Now will any one, who is forced by his Faith and Reaſon to acknowledge a ſpiritual ſubſtance is actually in two places at once, pawn his eternal ſalvation (as he does who purely for this difficulty continues Proteſtant) that God Almighty cannot by all his Omnipotency, make a corporeal ſubſtance be here and in Heaven at the ſame time? *He cannot do it.*

Now that the bread and wine in the Holy Euchariſt ſhould affect our ſenſes in the ſame manner as they did before their change into our *B*. Saviours body and blood, this ought to ſeem no impoſſible wonder to a Chriſtian, who believes ſo many miracles in our Lords Incarnation, Conception, and Nativity of a Virgin. Such a Miracle as this our Lord wrought when he ap-

Fit nothing like it

What ill does.

Sure it is a moſt notorious one.

what is that to Bodies? we know not the Nature of Spirits.

It does not appear that X did appear in ye Shape of a Gardner, only she in her Concern fancyed him so to be, but upon better Observation found her Mistake. Iohn 20: 15. 16.

appeared to S. *Mary Magdalen* in the shape of a Gardner. His face no doubt was his own true face, but it wrought upon S. *Mary Magdalens* eyes as if it had been the face of the Gardiner.

And here I had thought to have inserted the different ways, which different Schools of Catholick Divines take, to explicate how this high mystery is wrought. But my design being to satisfie Unbelievers as to the substance of the mystery, and not to puzle the Faith of Believers, by making them glare too wistly upon the manner how this divine secret is wrought, it being more safely admired, together with the mystery of the Incarnation and ever blessed Trinity, then curiously pried into; I resolved to draw a Veyl before it, by a profound silence of the several explications of Divines, and to content my self with letting you know in general, how different Doctors of different Philosophical Principles, according to their several Philosophies, differently explicate the mystery of the H. Eucharist, and defend it differently against Calvinists, as they do the mystery of the B. Trinity against the Antitrinitarians, and of the Incarnation of the Eternal Word against the Arrians; some by virtual distinction, others by real formal, and others otherwise. And yet all hold, that after Consecration, the bread is no longer bread, but is changed into the body of our Lord; but how it is done, some say one way, some another, according to their different Tenets in Philosophy, still all agreeing that this change is fitly called Transubstantiation, and that with good reason; for the same remaining the same, must needs be the same, and cannot possibly be made what it was not, without some change. The bread then that it may become our Savious body, must have some change wrought in it; but in its accidents its evident there is none, they remaining the same as before, therefore the change must be in the substance. And can now the change of the substance of bread, into the substance of our B. Lords body, be called by a fitter name than a substantial change, or Transubstantiation? And this some of the Learnedst of the Church of *England* would do well to reflect on; who urged by the clearness of our Saviviours own words; *This is my Body*, and the multitude of Testimonies of the Fathers of the first six hundred years, and the im-

Ay, & a very extraordinary one too.

Not One is of that Opinion, if their Words may be allowed a Rational Construction.

impoſſibility of ſuch a Doctrine over-ſpreading the whole Chriſtian world, without any appearance of its beginning, and the oppoſition it muſt needs have found by reaſon of its ſtrangeneſs both to ſence and reaſon, and its engaging the whole Church in a material, at leaſt, Idolatry, unleſs it had been taught the world at firſt by our B. Lord and his Apoſtles: I ſay ſome of the Learneſt of the Engliſh Clergy being urged by ſuch conſiderations as theſe, confeſs the Holy Euchariſt, as they begin to call it, after Conſecration to be really and truly our B. Saviours body, and therefore fall down before it, and adore it: and for this cauſe diſown the new Rubrick of the Common-prayer-book, which ſaies our Lords body is in Heaven, and not upon the Altar. Theſe Doctors will tell you they acknowledge the thing, only they dare not be ſo bold as the Romaniſts, to determine the manner. And one of the Learneſt of them, Mr. *Thorndike*, asks; why cannot our B. Saviour appear to us in what ſhape he pleaſes; in the ſhape of a Gardiner, or if it ſo pleaſe him, in the ſhape of bread and wine? Theſe Doctors, I ſay, would do well to reflect the Church of *Rome* has not determin'd the manner of our B. Saviours bodies being in the Sacrament, and therefore her Divines, ſome explicate it one way, ſome another; but only the thing it ſelf, the manner how, being left to the diſpute of her Doctors. *And are never likely to come to Agreement in it.*

an Oppoſition it ſeem had, e ever has had.

in a Spiritual Senſe. That's a Lye.

and this too.

2. *Aſſertion.* If our B. Saviour would have left us his ſacred body and blood, inſtead of all the Sacrifices of Sheep and Oxen, under the *Moſaical* diſpenſation, to be offered up by Chriſtian Prieſts, and to be fed upon by the Chriſtian people, it would have been a favour worthy of his exceſſive love to Mankind, by reaſon of the innumerable benefits which would have accrued to us by the continual oblition and preſence of ſo worthy a ſacrifice. What an incentive would this have been to Chriſtian piety? How would ſuch a Sacrifice as this have compell'd High and Low, Rich and Poor, Learned and Unlearned, with a ſtrange reverence to have flocked about our Chriſtian Altars, where not a Lamb or a Beaſt, but the body of God, and the blood of God, and by concomitancy whole God and Man, Chriſt Jeſus, ſhould have been offered up by choice Perſons to the Almighty for the good of the World? How would the preſence of ſuch an Oblation have kept them attentive, and encreaſed their fervor in their Prayers? when they ſhould have been able to have ſaid, *This before me, which I ſee with my eyes, is my dear Redeemer, and God that was Crucified for me, and is to be my Judge.*

How

How earneſtly ſhould we have made all our Petitions to him, and how heartily ſhould we have thanked him for all his Love? To underſtand this: Imagin our B. Saviour ſhould appear to you in your Chamber every Morning, in that very body and ſhape He is now in Heaven; were you aſſured it was he, and not an illuſion, with what humility would you proſtrate your ſelf before him? How heartily would you cry him mercy for all your ſins, and earneſtly recommend all the deſires of your ſoul unto him? And how would this high favour melt your ſoul into a moſt tender affection towards him? But theſe would have been the happy circumſtances of the whole Chriſtian world, would our Omnipotent Lord, out of his abundant goodneſs, have left us his ſacred ſelf, under the diſguiſe of the Accidents of bread and wine. The ſame Petitions, with a like fervour, would every Chriſtian have made every Holy Maſs, which you would have made every Morning upon ſuch an Apparition as was ſuppoſed.

My dear Jeſus, true God and Man, the very ſame who art in Heaven in all ſplendor and glory, art here upon the holy Altar before me, Veiled under the vile appearances of common bread and ordinary wine; and all this for my ſake, that to my ſouls health thou mighteſt be ſeen, handled, and taſted by me. Nor couldſt thou be hindred from this exceſs of Love to me unworthy Sinner, although thou didſt foreſee the Revilings thou wert to endure for it from ungrateful Calviniſts. Who for this would call thee a Breadden God, and reproach thy devout Adorers, as more ſtupid Idolaters than the very Pagan Worſhippers of Sun and Moon. Rather than I ſhould want the delicious comfort of thy continual preſence, the happy pledge of eternally ſeeing thee face to face: all this, and yet greater indignities wouldſt thou ſubject thy ſelf unto, by one to to be reviled by his impious tongue; by another to be trampled under his foul feet; by a third, to be caſt into ſome Sink or Jaques. O Impiety, O Ingratitude of ſinful men! O unheard of goodneſs of our deareſt Lord, thus to abject himſelf for our ſakes! But what wonder, if when he was in a paſſible mortal body he would permit himſelf by wicked Miſcreants to be torn with cruel Whips, to be beſpatterd with filthy Spittle, and to be made black and blew with ignominious buffets; what wonder now, when he is become immortal and impaſſible, and can ſuffer no more defilement from the baſeſt ordures, than do the bright Sun-beams from the fouleſt mud when they ſhine upon it, that he ſhould permit himſelf to be eaten by

Mice

Mice or Doggs, or ſuffer other viler indignities, if Sacrilegious Sinners will permit or cauſe them?

Moreover, ſuch a preſence of our great Lord, what an Incitement would it have been to pious Munificence in adorning our Chriſtian Churches with the richeſt Gold and moſt precious Stones, or what ever elſe that's rare and ſplendid, which Nature or Art does afford, making them little Heavens for luſtre and glory, and thereby exciting in the hearts of all that ſhould enter them a due reverence to the Almighty, whom we worſhip? If *Solomon* ſo adorned his Temple, where only a Sheep, or a Calf, or a little Incenſe was offered to the Creator of all things; what glory could have been thought too rich for our Chriſtian Churches, where an Oblation, worthy of the great God, ſhould every day have been Sacrificed unto him; the Lamb of God that takes away the ſins of the world; the God-Man Chriſt Jeſus. In fine, what vertue ſhould not our dear Saviour have given us example of, by ſuch a charitable humiliation of himſelf? Obedience, to come down from Heaven to Earth at the voice of every Chriſtian Prieſt, though never ſo ſimple for his underſtanding, or never ſo wicked for his life and manners. Charity, Humility, Patience, Contempt of the Judgments or ſayings of men, &c. *Well, & what does all this idle Talk ſignify? What if he had ſo commanded? ſince we know he has not.*

3. *Aſſertion.* The bread and wine in the Holy Euchariſt, are by the Omnipotent power of God actually, and in deed changed into the body and blood of our B. Saviour Jeſus Chriſt: which I prove thus. This was the univerſal belief of the Chriſtian world in the nineth Century after our B. Saviour, as is evident by the teſtimony of all the writings of that Age, and by the univerſal teſtimony of the tenth Age, who profeſs in all Chriſtian Countrys to have received this Faith from their immediate Anceſtors. Nor do our Adverſaries deny it, and therefore appeal to the firſt ſix hundred years, in which they ſay the Chriſtian doctrine remained incorrupt. But if the doctrine of the real mutation of bread and wine in the Holy Euchariſt into our B. Saviours body and blood was generally believed in the nineth Age, it muſt neceſſarily be taught in the firſt Age by the Apoſtles, to their firſt Converts over all the world, and conſequently be moſt certainly true. For it cannot be doubted but that the firſt Converts of the H. Apoſtles, did not only underſtand what the Apoſtles taught them concerning this great myſtery, but alſo did throughly believe it, and highly eſteem it (as they did all other doctrines and practices taught them by the ſame their firſt Maſters)

This is falſe, God has many names of moſt ignorant Sects of a Church that he loves.

Not in all Points in general, for there were many Hereſies even in this time.

That does not follow, for many other falſe Doctrines may be named that were generally received in Caſt Ages as a former Book talking of Chriſt is a Poſt Way of Reaſoning a Doctrine to be falſe, viz. That from the beginning it was not ſo.

sters) as not only of exceeding profit above all the things of this life, but also as highly necessary to them and their Children to bring them to eternal bliss. Which being so, none can doubt but that the same first Disciples, both could and would, and actually did teach the very same doctrine which they so highly esteemed, as to embrace it with the hazard of their lives, to their Children and Successors. And this they taught them not as an invention of their own, but as a doctrine taught them by the Apostles of Jesus Christ, who confirmed their Mission from the infallible God by evident miracles. In like manner it cannot be doubted but these taught their Children also concerning this mystery what they had been taught by their Fathers, and not as the invention of their Fathers, but as a doctrine taught their Fathers by the undoubted Messengers of Heaven, the Holy Apostles. The like may be said of all the intervening Generations for the first six hundred years, which our Adversaries do not deny (though it be all one to the force of this Argument, to grant so much only for the first four hundred years). Now if Transubstantiation was not taught for the first six hundred years, but the contrary; whatsoever age, be it the seventh, eighth, or nineth, would begin to teach the doctrine of the real presence of our Lords body in the Sacrament; they could not possibly have the impudence to tell their Children the bread and wine in the Eucharist were turned into the true body and blood of our Saviour; and thus they had been taught by their Fathers and Grandfathers uninterruptedly from the Apostles. This, I say, it is impossible they could have the Impudence to assert, when every one must needs know his Father and Grand-father had believed and taught him otherwise. What must they pretend then, to impose upon their Children this new and strange mysterious Doctrine? They must tell them their Fathers and Grand-fathers, and other Ancestors, for some hundreds of years had been in an Error, and had forsaken the Doctrine taught by the Apostles, and their first Converts as to this mystery, and confirm their Assertion by the clear words of Holy Scripture, *Take and Eat, this is my Body*, &c. and by other testimonies out of the Writers of the first or second Century. But no History makes mention of any such manner of bringing in the Doctrine of Transubstantiation in the seventh, eighth, or other Century: Therefore it was never so brought in, but was always believed; nor indeed could it ever in any Century be brought in by the Church of Christ, whose custom has ever been, not only in the seventh and eighth, but in every other

But we know after what manner, & for what purpose it was brought in.

Century

Century before & after, alwaies to teach, and to pretend to teach her Children, not Doctrins deviſed or found out by herſelf by reading the Holy Scriptures or other means, but what was taught her by her Fore-Elders uninterruptedly from the Apoſtles: and ſtill when Hereticks, or beginners of any new Doctrin, in any age, pretended Scriptures for them, ſhe oppoſed: we have been taught otherwiſe by our Anceſters, and to underſtand thoſe Scriptures in another ſenſe than you underſtand them. Which way of Teaching a bringer in of a new Doctrine, its evident could not uſe. For if he did not begin to teach his Child otherwiſe than he was taught by his Father, he ſhould teach no new or other Doctrine. But if he did begin to teach his Child otherwiſe than his Father taught him, he could not at the ſame time tell his Child, thus he was taught by his Father, and ſo upward from the Apoſtles, when both his own Conſcience, and all his Neighbours would teſtifie the contrary. *Calvin*, for example, could not tell his Child that he was taught by his Father to deny Tranſubſtantiation. No more could the firſt Teacher of Tranſubſtantiation in the ſeventh or other Century, had it been a Novelty tell his Child he was ſo taught to believe by his Father, but muſt have pretended to have more light than his Father and Anceſters, as our Adverſaries did when they began to deny it.* Hence it is evident Tranſubſtantiation was not begun in the ſeventh or other Century, but was alwaies believed ſince the Apoſtles, ſeeing that in the nineth Century Chriſtians univerſally believed, that in the holy Euchariſt the bread and wine were changed into the body and blood of our Saviour; and as ſuch adored them, and embraced this doctrine of the real preſence, not as a doctrine newly found out by themſelves, or their immediate Fore-fathers by reading the holy Scriptures or other means, but as taught them by their Fore-fathers uninterruptedly from the Apoſtles; and ſeeing likewiſe this has ever been the way of the Catholick Church to teach and pretend to teach Poſterity not new Doctrines of her own, but what ſhe had learnt from her Anceſtors.

* And as Papiſts did when they began to broach it.

Hence *S. Vincent Lerinenſis*, twelve hundred years ago, in his Golden Treatiſe againſt the profane Innovations of Hereſies, upon thoſe words of S. *Paul. Siquis*, &c. *If any one Evangelize to you, beſides what you have received, let him be* Anathema. Sed forſitan, *&c. But perhaps thoſe things were commanded the* Galatians *only. Then thoſe things alſo which follow in the ſame Epiſtle, were commanded the* Galatians *only. Be not deſirous of vain-glory, pro-*

voking one another, envying one another. Or perhaps was it then commanded, if any one announce, beſides what has been announced, let him be Anathematized; but now it is not commanded. Therefore, and that alſo which he there ſaies: But I ſay, walk in the Spirit, and do not perfect the deſires of the Fleſh, was then only commanded, but is not now commanded. But if it be impious and pernicious to believe ſo, it neceſſarily follows, that as theſe things are to be obſerved by all Ages, ſo thoſe things alſo which are eſtabliſhed concerning not changing the Faith, are commanded to all Ages. Wherefore it was never lawful, it is not now lawful, nor ever ſhall be lawful to Chriſtian Catholicks to announce any thing beſides what they have received. ----Let him cry and cry again, and to all, and alwaies, and every where let him cry by his Epiſtle, that Veſſel of Election, that Maſter of the Gentils, that Trumpet of the Apoſtles, that Preacher of the World, Conſcious to the ſecrets of Heaven, let him cry; if any one preach a new Doctrine let him be Anathematiz'd. And on the contrary ſide, let certain Froggs, and Cynifes and Flies that are to periſh; ſuch as are the Pelagians reclame and this to Catholiks; We, ſay they, being Authors, we being Heads, we being Expoſitors, Condemn what ye did hold, hold what ye did Condemn, reject the ancient Faith, the inſtiutions of your Fathers, the depoſitions of your Anceſtors, and receive; but what? I have a horror to mention them, for they are ſuch proud things, &c. But may not general Councils at leaſt preſume to teach new Doctrines? Hear the ſame *S. Vincent*, chap. 32. *Hoc ſemper nequequicquam praterea, &c. The Catholick Church excited by the Novelties of Hereticks, by the decrees of her Councils ever did this, and nothing more than this, what ſhe had received by Tradition only; this ſhe conſigned to Poſterity by writing, comprehending a great ſum of things in a few letters, and for the moſt part for the light of underſtanding, ſigning the not new ſenſe of Faith with the propriety of a new name.*

Take notice that the Chriſtian Church uſing this means to preſerve the Faith firſt received, its impoſſible ſhe ſhould ever loſe or change it. For if Fathers from the beginning had reſolved to teach their Children what they had learnt, or even thought they had learnt from their Parents, as to the point of the Real preſence or other doctrine, its impoſſible they ſhould teach another doctrine. For ſhould they teach another doctrine, it muſt happen, either becauſe they were ignorant what was taught them by their Parents, which is impoſſible, not only to whole Nations, but even to the In-

habitants,

habitants of one ſmall Town; or elſe, becauſe, though they knew what was taught by their Parents, yet they would teach otherwiſe than they had been taught; but then they muſt forſake their firſt reſolution of teaching their Children what they thought they had learnt from their Fathers, contrary to the Suppoſition. But on the other ſide let us ſuppoſe a book fully written, as to all points to be believed by Chriſtians, by the firſt teachers of Chriſtianity. Let them together, with this Book, give charge to their firſt Converts, neither to add to it, nor to diminiſh it, and to believe as in their Conſciences they ſhall think that Book ſhall teach them. Though Generation after Generation be never ſo faithful to ſuch a charge, yet they may in after Ages come to loſe or change their Faith becauſe the Book may ſeem to one Generation to bear one ſenſe, and to another Generation to bear another: Eſpecially if the myſteries to be believed be very ſublime, and the Book obſcure in many places, and admit of divers ſenſes when it ſpeaks of thoſe myſteries. For example; theſe words, *This is my Body*, may ſeem to one Age to bear this ſenſe, This is a ſign of my body; and to another, This is really and truly my body. But no ten Families who have been taught by their Parents, either to believe our Saviours body is in the Euchariſt, or that it is not there, can poſſibly miſtake what their immediate Fathers taught them, and frequently inculcated to them, as to this point, both by themſelves and choice perſons ordained on purpoſe for this end, to teach what they learnt from their immediate Maſters and Fathers. Nothing can make a change here, but a reſolution to go contrary to what they know was taught them by their Parents. Wherefore ſeeing God Almighty is reſolved not to teach every Age by immediate infallible Miſſionants from himſelf, but to ſend inſpired Ambaſſadors to one particular Generation only, and to leave that Generation to teach their Children ſucceſſively till the day of Judgment, what they learnt from the immediate infallible Meſſengers of Heaven: And ſeeing alſo a Book, with a charge not to change or alter it, and with a charge alſo to follow what ſhould ſeem to every Generation to be the ſenſe of it, and ſuppoſing every Generation faithful to ſuch a charge, would not have been a ſufficient means to keep the firſt divine Faith from Corruption, we may ſafely conclude the Almighty has not taken that way to teach the world. But ſeeing *Oral* teaching by inſpired Paſtors at firſt, with a charge to every Generation to follow what they thought was taught them by their immediate Parents and Teachers, provided every Generation

* Which is a very ſtrange one, as if there were no other Way or means to convey the Doctrine of Xt. but by Parents teaching their Children.

But ſuppoſe they were not.

What a pity it is that they were not

neration were true to this charge, would have kept the first Faith inviolate, we may also conclude the Almighty has taken this way. Especially finding a Congregation of so vast a spread in being, who pretends to have made use of this means to preserve her first Faith, taught her Ancestors many hundred years ago; nor can she be evinced by any History or Tradition, or any thing but mere sayings and ungrounded surmises, to have lost or changed her first belief. And if you will make use of a Book to guide you in your Faith, as the Catholick Church also does, you must resolve to interpret it, (if you will be sure not to mistake) as she does; that is, in that sense in which it was understood by your Fathers, and not in that sense it shall seem to bear to you, if contrary to the sense it seemed to bear to your Ancestors. Pardon Sir, this long digression, I hope it will conduce to your more full satisfaction. I don't know who it can satisfy.

They may be professors but we know they were not.

And take notice, that whereseoever Transubstantiation is believed, the believers of it profess to have been so taught by their Fore-fathers uninterruptedly from the Apostles: & whereseoever this mystery is denied, the deniers of it do not profess to have been taught to deny it by their Fathers uninterruptedly from the Apostles, but only by their Ancestors for about a hundred and fifty years; and that their Ancestors about the year fifteen hundred, had more light than their Progenitors for about a thousand years, who were all in darkness, and had left the right Faith taught by the Apostles, and for the first six hundred years of Christianity. An evident conviction this, that the denial of Transubstantiation is a Novelty, and the asserting of it the antient verity. For had Transubstantiation been a new Doctrin, and never heard of before the seventh or eighth Age, the Assertors of it must have been forced to plead for it, after the manner its Opposers plead against it; by saying their Fore fathers only for so long, for example, for eight hundred years had believed it; but in the year eight hundred, their Ancestors had more light than their Fore-fathers, and they by reading the Holy Scriptures and Fathers of the first Century, came to understand that our Saviours true body was in the Holy Eucharist, and that their immediate Progenitors for five or six hundred years, had left the first Apostolical doctrin as to this mystery.

Pray let us speak for ourselves & we will give stronger reasons than these.

page 7. If you remember, I supposed from the confession of our Adversaries, that the Christian Doctrin remained pure and incorrupt for some Centuries of years, after its first planting; which I now shall endeavor to prove. And indeed whosoever maturely considers the genius

genius and temper of the Christian Doctors and Bishops, for the first Centuries after our Saviour, will find it impossible for all the power of Hell to impose a Novelty upon them, especially such an one as would make them all Idolaters. For they were not like the seeming Zelots of our Age, pretenders to new lights, but their profession was not to correct Antiquity, not to deliver to Posterity doctrins of their own devising, but carefully to keep what they had received from their Fore-fathers, and faithfully to teach their Children what they had been taught by their Fathers: And their great Answer to Introducers of new Doctrins or Practices, was, *Nihil nouandum nisi quod traditum est: We must innovate nothing, but stick close to what has been delivered to us by our Fore-fathers.* As for pretenders to discover new Truths by reading of the holy Scriptures, its easily conceivable how such persons may be imposed upon by subtil Sophisters, and made to believe erroneous doctrins; to wit, by bad and new Interpretations of good and antient Scriptures. But on the other side, how shall a Teacher of Novelties deceive a Christian Country, which is resolved to hold fast whatsoever doctrin was taught them by their immediate Progenitors, who received the same doctrin by an uninterrupted delivery from Father to Son, from the Apostles? Let him pretend Scriptures, and bring a thousand places out of the Law, Psalms, Prophets, and Apostles; what will the Reply be? The Scriptures you alledge we reverence, and have ever been taught to reverence them as divine; but we have been taught to interpret and understand them in another manner and sense than you alledge them. Let him pretend Authority of Doctors, as Learned as *Origen*, as Holy as *Cyprian*; nay, if he will, of a whole Provincial Council, as numerous as that in *Africa*, which determin'd Rebaptization of persons Baptized by Hereticks; they Reply, we must not Innovate, we must hold to what was taught us by our Ancestors. What means then to make persons thus disposed to leave their antient Faith, and admit of a Novelty? You must prove to them, that you and they, and other Christians in several Countrys, have been taught so to believe by your immediate Predecessors, and uninterruptedly From Father to Son, from the Apostles: but then you cease to be a Teacher of Novelties, contrary to the Supposition. *This Author has a rare knack at Suppositions. Is that a Supposition it here?*

I find now he can allow other Ways of bringing in of false Doctrines besides that of Authors teaching their Children.

Now that such was the disposition of the Primitive Centuries of Christianity, hear S. *Vincent Lerinensis*, who lived in the fifth Age, who testifies, that often asking of very many his Contemporaries, famous

famous for their Sanctity and Learning, how he might be able to diſcern the truth of the Catholick Faith from the falſity of Heretical pravity, he always received this Anſwer in a manner from them all: *That if he deſired to remain ſound in his Faith, he muſt fortifie it; firſt with the Authority of the divine Law, and then with the Tradition of the Catholick Church.* That is, as he explicates himſelf afterwards, he muſt examin what has always, all over the Chriſtian Church, and by all Chriſtian Doctors, or in a manner by all, been believed, and hold to that againſt all Novelty, though defended by private Doctors, never ſo Holy, or never ſo Learned, or producing never ſo many Scriptures for themſelves, if interpreted after a new manner. But ſaies the ſame *S. Vincent*, chap. 2. *Here perhaps ſome body may ask, ſeeing the Canon of the Scriptures is perfect, and is it ſelf ſufficient, and more than ſufficient for all things, what need is there to add to it the Authority of the Eccleſiaſtical, or Churches underſtanding of it? Becauſe the Holy Scripture, by reaſon of its depth, is not by all taken in one and the ſame ſenſe.---- For* Photinus *expounds it one way*, Sabellius *another*, Donatus *another*, Arrius *another*. And *ch.* 41. He tells us how the third general Council held in his days at *Epheſus*, proceeding according to this rule, condemn'd *Neſtorius*. For the Fathers of that Chriſtian Synod, in number about 200. having conſulted the Sentiment of their Predeceſſors, the eminent Doctors of the Oriental and Weſtern Churches, S. *Peter* of *Alexandria*, S. *Athanaſius*, S. *Theophilus*, S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, S. *Baſil*, S. *Gregory Nyſſen*, S. *Felix*, S. *Julius*, S. *Cyprian*, concerning their controverſie in debate, they reſolved to hold their doctrin, to follow their Counſel, to believe their teſtimony, to obey their Judgment. *Quæ tandem*, &c *What were at length* (ſaies S. *Vincent*) *the Voices and Votes of them all, but that what was anſiently delivered ſhould be kept, what was of late invented ſhould be exploded? After which we admired and proclamed the great humility and ſanctity of that Council. In which ſo many Prieſts, in a manner as to the greater part, were ſo many Metropolitans, and of ſo great Erudition and Learning, as they were almoſt all able to diſpute of Dogms. To whom, when their gathering together in one, ſeemed to add a confidence of daring and decreeing ſomething from themſelves, yet notwithſtanding they would preſume nothing, arrogate nothing at all to themſelves, but took all poſſible heed leſt they ſhould deliver to their Poſterity what themſelves had not received from their Fathers; and not only well diſpoſed the matter for the preſent, but alſo gave*

gave example to them that were to come after them, to wit, that they should reverence the dogms of sacred Antiquity, and condemn (Adinventa) *the additional inventions of profane Novelty.* This then was not an Age wherein to introduce new doctrins into the Church, nor any other before S. *Vincent.* For he tells us, *chap 9. Mos iste,* &c. *That custome has always flourished in the Church, and by how much any one hath been more Religious, the more readily has he opposed new inventions. We have hereof plenty of examples every where.* The same S. *Vincent* witnesses, that in the third Age, the Assertors of Rebaptization wanted neither wit nor eloquence, nor number, nor verisimilitude of Truth, nor Oracles of the divine Law, but understood in a bad and new manner. *chap. 9,* and 10. How came they then to lose their cause? S. *Stephen* and his Collegues reclamed, *Nihil novandum,* &c. *Nothing is to be innovated besides what has been delivered to us. Agrippinus,* Bishop of *Carthage,* holding Rebaptization against the rule of the Universal Church, against the sense of all his fellow Priests, against the custom and institutions of his Ancestors; and hereby (as S. *Vincent* observes) giving a form of Sacriledge to all Hereticks, this overthrew him.

Had now the doctrin of the Real presence been an Idolatrous Novelty, its manifest no Introducer of it could have perswaded it to a Christian Church thus principled as the Doctors of these times were. They would all unanimously have reclamed; Nothing must be innovated, besides what has been delivered to us by our Ancestors.

You say well here, but y'age y' brought forth Transub: was not thus principled.

Moreover, that the Christian doctrin remained pure and incorrupt for some Centuries of years, after its first planting, is further evinced by considering the state of the Christian Church for the first 300. years; to wit, that it was severely persecuted all the world over. Now can any reasonable man imagin, that they who were continually exposing their lives for their Religion, would if they could agree together, so notoriously to change it, as to make themselves most gross Idolaters by adoring bread and wine, as the true body and blood of their Creator and God. Nor can it be imagin'd when the Centuries of the persecuted state of the Church were ended, that the Christians now in a full liberty of professing and practising their Faith, would all on the sudden so notoriously change that Faith which had been delivered them by their Fore-fathers, who had seal'd it with their blood. And this none can doubt of, who reflects how tenacious all man-kind is of that Religion they were bred up in. In so much, as let any one consult the whole world, and he shall ne-

They did not.

ver find so much as one Nation or Country, to have changed their Religion without a great deal of noise and difficulty, and a considerable length of time; and so as Posterity could for many Ages give an account of such a change, how and by what means it happened, so as to satisfie any rational demander of an account of such a change, without flying to imperceptible mutations, by little and little, but when or by whom no account is to be given: The usual refuge of our Adversaries, when we demand of them how not one Country, but all the Christian Countrys in the world, came to believe so universally this strange doctrin of the change of Bread and Wine into our B. Saviours body and blood. The whole world formerly in a manner Pagan, except a handful of *Jews*, is now become Christians; we give an account of it. Twelve men dividing the world amongst them by stupendious Miracles, a holy life and glorious death, converted great numbers of several Nations to the Christian Faith; and these taught it their Children under sharp persecutions for some three hundred years; and after that, through the favour of Emperors and Kings, Converted to be Christians, it made that spread we now see. Arrianism over-ran a great part of the Christian world, and we are able to give an account how, and by what means, without recurring to imperceptible growing by little and little, *Arrius* first broach'd that Heresie, and by the favour of Emperors, it got a great footing in Christendom. In like manner had the strange doctrin of Transubstantiation been a Novel Invention; 'tis not possible, but at first teaching, it must needs have been opposed, and could not have so over-spread the Christian world in the nineth Century, as its evident to any one versed in Ecclesiastical History it did, without great preaching of its first Abettors, and strange favour of Christian Princes. That the whole Christian world, for the first six hundred years, should be wholly ignorant of this strange mysterious doctrin, and so hard to be believed; and that in the nineth Century it should be generally believed, and not as a new doctrin neither, which was pretended by that Age to have been found out by vertue of greater light, by reading the Holy Scriptures, *&c.* but as a doctrin they had been taught from their Fore-fathers by an immemorable Tradition, is harder to believe than the mystery it self to any judicious considerer; how difficultly, as I hinted above, we are perswaded to leave the doctrins we have been taught by our Parents from our Child-hood.

Arrianism was opposed, & yet it spread, as you say, & why might not your Transub:

In confirmation of this, let but any one consider the state of our own

own Country. About the year 1500. we generally believed and adored the bread and wine in the H. Euchariſt, as our B. Saviours true body and blood. Now 'tis confeſs'd, we, a hundred for one, believe the contrary. But how was this new Faith bred in us? By ſtopping the mouthes of all the Preachers of the antient myſterious doctrin, and by perſecuting with ſevere Laws, all Profeſſors of that antient Faith. And yet you ſee even all this diligence has not been able to root out the antient belief univerſally neither. Much-leſs was what has been done, ~~been~~ effected ſo without noiſe; but all our Chronicles mention how our new belief was wrought. And can any one think that not one Kingdom, but all the Kingdoms of the Chriſtian world, could be brought ſo univerſally to change their Faith without any mention in any Hiſtory, how and by whom this ſtrange change was wrought? Eſpecially if he reflect how hardly human nature does believe ſtrange things which neither ſenſe nor reaſon can give any evidence of: And on the contrary, how eaſily and gladly we relinquiſh Beliefs which have been impoſed upon us, when we have, as we think, the evidence both of ſenſe and reaſon for our change. All which notwithſtanding, you ſee how that after a 150. years labour, neither eloquence of falſe Teachers, nor force of civil powers, has been able ſo wholly to pervert our Nation as to the belief of that high myſtery of the real preſence, but even ſtill there remain a conſiderable number retainers of the antient belief. And can you think that not in a much greater ſpace of time, to wit, betwixt the ſixth and nineth Century all the Chriſtian world could be perſwaded to admit ſo ſtrange a doctrin to nature and reaſon; and yet no man by vertue of Hiſtory or Tradition ſhould be able to give any account what Orators prevailed with the world to relinquiſh the belief of their Anceſtors, or what power of civil Magiſtrates forced them to it? Eſpecially ſeeing there have not wanted Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorigraphers who have made mention of matters of far leſs note than ſuch a change of Faith muſt needs have made. But what place will there remain for doubting, that this high myſtery was always believed, if not only all writers be ſilent as to any change, but alſo the ſeventh and eighth Age; yea, the moſt Primitive times do poſitively atteſt this very myſtery by the pens of the chiefeſt Champions of the Chriſtian Church, who have left us any memorials of their learning and piety in their deſervedly admired works? I ſhall faithfully recount their words; be your own judge what their ſentiment was.

We are not deſtitute of Information of it.

In the first place then, glorious Saint, and great Doctor S. *Augustin*, tell us your Faith concerning the Holy Eucharist; Is it Bakers bread, or the body of our Lord and God? *I remember*, saies the holy Doctor in his 28. Ser. *de verbis Domini, when I treated of the Sacraments, I told you that before the words of Christ, that which is offered up is called Bread, but when the words of Christ shall have been pronounced, now it is no longer called bread, but the body of Christ.* And explicating those words of the Royal Prophet, *Psal.* 98. v. 5: *Exalt ye our Lord God, and adore his foot-stool, for it is holy.* Now what is this Foot-stool of God? why saies this great Doctor, *The Earth is his Foot-stool.* But how is the Earth holy, and to be adored by us? The Saint goes on and tells us how: *Our Lord took Earth of the Earth, because Flesh is of the Earth; and he took Flesh of the Flesh of* Mary. *And because he walked here in Flesh, and gave to us that very Flesh to be eaten by us to our Salvation; but no body eats that Flesh, unless he shall first have adored it.* And indeed what could we expect that S. *Austin* should teach and believe concerning this divine Sacrament, but what he had been taught by his Father and Instructor in Christ, the glorious St. *Ambrose.* And what was that? Hear his words, *lib.* 4. De Sacramentis. *Thou wilt perhaps say nnto me, my Bread is ordinary Bread; but that bread is bread before the Sacramental words; but when Consecration has been made of bread, it is made the Flesh of Christ. But how can bread be the body of Christ? By Consecration: Consecration; by what and whose words is it perfected? By the words of our Lord Jesus. For all other things which are said, Praise is given to God: By prayer supplication is made for the people, for Kings, for the rest. When the time is come that the Venerable Sacrament is to be made, now the Priest does not use his own words, but the words of Christ; therefore the word of Christ makes this Sacrament. But what word of Christ? That word by which all things were made. Our Lord commanded and Heaven was made; our Lord commanded and the Earth was made: Our Lord commanded, and the Seas were made: Our Lord commanded, and every Creature was produced. Doest thou see then how operative the word of Christ is? If then there be so great force in the word of our Lord Jesus, that it could make things which were not begin to be; how much rather is it operative, that those things which were, should be, and be charged into another thing? Heaven was not, the Sea was not, the Earth was not; but hear him saying: He said the word, and they were made; he commanded, and they were Created. That therefore I*

Observe it is only so called, & so we own it was usually, but in a Spiritual Sense.

may

may Anſwer thee; the body of Chriſt was not before Conſecration; but after Conſecration, I ſay unto thee, that now the Body of Chriſt is. He ſaid it, and it was made: He commanded, and it was Created. And in *chap.* 5. of the ſame Book. *Before the words of Chriſt, the Chalice is full of Wine and Water; but when the words of Chriſt have had their operation, then it is made the blood which Redeemed the people. See then in how many kinds of things the word of Chriſt is able to change all things. Moreover our Lord Jeſus himſelf teſtifies unto us, that we receive his body and blood; ought we then to doubt of his teſtification? Who ſays we do not, in a ſpiritual ſenſe?*

Add to S. *Auſtin* and S. *Ambroſe*, the Learned S. *Hierom* in his Epiſtle *ad Heliodorum. Far be it from me*, ſaies the Saint, *that I ſhould ſpeak amiſs of thoſe who ſucceeding the Apoſtles, do make the body of Chriſt with their ſacred mouth.* And in his 85. Epiſtle to *Enagrius. By whoſe prayers the body and blood of Chriſt is made.* Take notice that theſe three Holy Fathers lived not four hundred years after our B. Saviours death. S. *Cyprian* yet nearer the Apoſtles age, does no leſs clearly nor fully atteſt the ſame verity, in his Serm. *de Cœna Domini. That bread which our Lord gave to his Diſciples, being changed not in ſhape, but in its nature, by the Omnipotency of the Word was made Fleſh.* And in his Book, *de Lapſis*; reprehending ſuch as were angry with the Prieſts of God, who refuſed to admit them to the holy Communion of the B. Sacrament, after they had polluted themſelves with the profane Sacrifices of Heathen Idolaters, expreſſes their ſin in theſe words. *He that has fall'n from his Faith, threatens them that have ſtood firm. Sacrilegious wretch, he is angry with the Prieſts of God, that he is not preſently admitted with defiled hands to receive the Body of our Lord, or to drink his blood with his defiled mouth.* And this was the very doctrin of his learned Maſter *Tertullian*, who yet nearer approached the holy Apoſtles, *lib. de Reſur. car. The Fleſh is fed with the body and blood of Chriſt, that the ſoul may be made fat with God.* And in his Book *de Idololatria*, he complains of the profaneneſs of ſome Chriſtians, who made no ſcruple to day to be working in their Shops, making Idolatrous Statues for the Heathens, and yet to morrow would preſume to come into the Chriſtian Congregations, and receive the Sacred myſteries of our Lords body and blood, and communicate them to others. His words are theſe; *To touch the body of our Lord with thoſe hands which give bodies to Devils. Nor is this all; their Crime would be leſs, did they only receive from the hands of others what they*

con-

contaminate and pollute; but moreover they deliver to others what they have polluted. Makers of Idols are admitted into the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy. O Impiety! Once the Jews laid profane hands on Chriſt; theſe daily violate his body: O hands deſerving to be cut off!

But ſhall we deſire a Greek Father or two, to give us their ſenſe concerning our preſent Controverſie. S. *Cryſoſt. ho.* 60. *ad. pop. Antioch. Becauſe the Word ſaies, This is my Body, let us aſſent and believe.* And a little after, *How many are there now adaies that ſay, O that I could ſee his Figure, his Garments, his Shoes? Lo thou ſeeſt himſelf, thou toucheſt him, thou eateſt him. Thou deſireſt to ſee his Garments, but he give thee not only to ſee, but alſo to eat and touch, and take himſelf into thee.* And a little after, *Conſider what an indignation thou haſt againſt the Traytor* Judas, *and againſt thoſe that Crucified him: Therefore conſider leſt thou alſo beeſt not guilty of the body and blood of Chriſt. They killed his moſt holy body; and thou receiveſt it with a polluted ſoul after ſo many benefits. For he was not ſatisfied to be made man, to be Buffetted and Crucified: but moreover, he does mix himſelf with us, and makes us his body, not only by Faith, but in very deed.* And *ho.* 24. in Ep. 1. ad Corin. *Chriſt has given us his body, both that we might have it and might eat it, which is the greateſt ſign of love. Wherefore* Job chap. 31. *that he might ſhow the love of his Servants to him, ſaid they oftentimes of their exceeding great love to him, would ſay concerning him, Who will give us of his Fleſh, that we might be filled with it. Even ſo Chriſt has given us his Fleſh, that we might feed upon it, thereby to allure us to love him very much. This body the Sages adored in the Manger.——Thou ſeeſt it not in the Manger, but upon the Altar; not a Woman holding it in her arms, but a Prieſt preſent.- - Nor do I ſhow thee Angels, nor Arch-angels, nor Heaven, nor the Heaven of Heavens, but the very Lord of all theſe things.------Nor doeſt thou only ſee him, but touch him; not only touch him, but eat him; and having received him, returns to thy home.* And Hom. 60. ad pop. Antioch. and 83. in Matth. *Let us every where believe God, and not oppoſe him, although that which he ſaies ſeem abſurd to our ſenſe and thoughts; let his ſpeech overcome both our ſenſe and our reaſon; which let us do in all things, and eſpecially in the Myſteries, not only regarding thoſe things which lie before us, but alſo holding faſt to his words. For we cannot be deceived by his words, but our ſenſe is moſt eaſily deceived: thoſe cannot be falſe, this is deceived very often. Becauſe therefore he has ſaid this is my body, let us make no doubt but believe, and ſee it with the*

eyes of our understanding. And in his 3. ho. in Ep. ad Ephes. *Let us think that him that sits above, who is adored by the Angels, 'tis him that we taste, that we feed upon.* And ho. 2. ad pop. Antioc. Elias *left his Disciple his Mantle, but the Son of God ascending, left us his Flesh. But* Elias *indeed put off his Mantle, but Christ both left us his Flesh, and retaining it, ascended with it. Let us not therefore be disheartened, nor lament, nor fear the difficulty of the times. For he that has not refused to shed his blood for us, and has communicated to us both his flesh and blood, will not refuse to do any thing for our Salvation.*

Hear another Greek Doctor, S. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, in his Catechistical discourses, which are the plainest declarations of the mysteries of our holy Faith. *Catech. 4. Myst. Seeing then Christ himself so affirms and says concerning the bread,* This is my body, *who after this can dare to doubt of it? and the same also affirming and saying,* This is my blood, *who I say can doubt of it, and say it is not his blood. He changed water into wine in* Cana *of* Galilee, *by his sole Will, and shall he not be worthy whom we may believe, that he changed wine into his blood? For if being invited to a corporeal Wedding, he wrought a stupendious miracle, shall we not confess him much rather to have given his body and blood to the Children of the Bridegroom? Wherefore with all assurance let us take the body and blood of Christ; for under the appearance of bread, is given to thee his body; and under the appearance of wine, is given his blood; that having received the body and blood of Christ, thou maiest be made partaker together with him of his body and Blood. So shall we be* Christophers, *such as carry Christ in them, when we shall have received his body and blood into our Members; and so as S.* Peter *saies, shall be made partakers of the divine Nature.---Do not therefore look upon it as bare bread and bare wine; for it is the body and blood of Christ, according to the words of our Lord himself. For although thy sense suggest this to thee, yet let Faith confirm thee; do not judge of the thing by thy taste, but rather from Faith hold for certain, so that thou hast no doubt that the body and blood are given to thee. Knowing and accounting for most certain, that this bread which is seen by us is not bread, although our taste judge it to be bread, but that it is the body of Christ. And the wine, which is seen by us, although it may seem wine to our sense of tasting, that yet it is not wine but the blood of Christ.* Can the holy Council of *Trent* have plainer words than these, or fuller to our present purpose. Add the testimony of S. *Justin Martyr*, who lived yet nearer the Age of the Apo-

This is a good Argument against Transubst. for y water made Wine may no longer be water but real Wine.

Thus fare they all our Brothers.

Apoſtles, in his Apology for the Chriſtians to *Antoninus* the Emperor, in which he gives him an account of the Chriſtian Faith; and where certainly he would not make it more myſterious than it was, nor more hard to be believed, according to any part of it, than the truth and common belief of Chriſtians forced him; but rather would moderate the myſteriouſneſs of it, than encreaſe it. Hear him then giving an account of the Holy Euchariſt. *This meat is called by us the Euchariſt, becauſe no body may partake of it, but he who believes thoſe things to be true which we ſay, and lives ſo as Chriſt has taught us. For we do not take theſe things as common and ordinary bread, but as by the word of God, our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt was made man, and had fleſh and blood for our Salvation; ſo we have been taught that this meat, which is Conſecrated by the Prayers of that ſpeech we received from him, is the fleſh and blood of Jeſus Chriſt, who was made man. For the Apoſtles in their Commentaries, which are called Goſpels, have delivered that Chriſt ſo commanded, and that having taken bread, when he had given thanks, he ſaid,* Do this in memory of me, This is my Body; *and having taken the Cup, when we had given thanks, he ſaid alſo,* This is my blood; *and gave it to them only.* Mark how this holy Father ſaies, that what we have received concerning the holy Euchariſt, is, that it is both the fleſh and blood of Jeſus Chriſt, who was made man. Now would any man in his wits have given ſuch an account of the Chriſtian Faith to an unbelieving Heathen, with a deſire to Convert him, and to recommend our holy Faith to him, had the bleſſed Euchariſt been a mere ſign of the fleſh and blood of Chriſt. This he would eaſily have underſtood to be very feaſable, whereas the other ſtrangely ſhocks both his ſenſe and reaſon. For other Teſtimonies out of theſe and other Holy Fathers, I refer you to our Books of Controverſie on this Subject, which are full of them. *And ſo it does mind. To little purpoſe.*

And who now that has the leaſt grain of Humility and Modeſty, would not bluſh to accuſe ſo many and ſo grave Doctors of Chriſt's Church of Idolatry and damnable Error? And here Sir, you muſt give me leave to beſpeak our Adverſaries in the words of S. *Auguſtin*, directed by him to *Julian* the *Pelagian*, after a like Citation, about another matter, of theſe very Holy Fathers by me now cited, as to a good part of them. *Tu qui tam crebro, &c. Thou ſadly deluded* Calviniſt, *that doeſt ſo often object to us Catholick Chriſtians the crime* of Idolatry for adoring the Holy Euchariſt; *if thou beeſt awake, ſee what and what kind of men, and how glorious Defenders of*

the

the Christian Faith, thou dareſt to beſpatter under our names, with ſo execrable a Crimination. Go now and object to us the crime of Idolatry, diſſemble and feign thy ſelf not to know what they ſay in this point; over-look them as it were, and attack us only, as not knowing that under our name they are reviled; and confidently inſult over ſo many and ſo great Doctors of the Church of Chriſt, who after a moſt Saintly life, and having beaten down the Errors of their times, moſt gloriouſly went out of this life before you and your Comerades bubled up. Doeſt thou ſee with what kind of men we ſuſtain thy reproaches; doeſt thou ſee with whom we have the ſame common cauſe, which without any ſober conſideration thou Calumniates and endeavours to expugn? Doeſt thou ſee, proud Calviniſt, how pernicious it is unto thy ſelf to object ſo horrible a crime of Idolatry to ſuch men as theſe, and how glorious it is to us to ſuſtain the charge of any crime, together with ſuch Doctors? Or if thou doeſt ſee, ſee, and hold thy peace, and let ſo many Catholick tongues ſilence thy Calviniſtical tongue, and ſubmit thy brazen forehead to the venerable mines of ſo many grave Fathers. The Ruffian Polemus *to compleat his wilde ramble, wouldneeds early in the morning, half Drunk with his Night-Revels, go to the School of the Grave* Sophiſt Xenocrates, *to affront him and his Scholars. But he was no ſooner entred the School of that ſober Platoniſt, but the very ſight of the modeſt and grave Comportment of the Philoſopher and his Scholars did ſo ſtrike my young gallant, that he was quite out of Countenance; and aſham'd of himſelf, he pull'd off his drunken bayes, and compos'd himſelf to modeſty, and became his Convert, whom he came on purpoſe to deride and ſcoff at. Such force had the grave Countenances of a ſober Platoniſt and his School to compleat a rude Ruffian. Finding my preſuptuous Calviniſt drunk with pride and ſelf-conceit, I could think of no better means to reduce him to Sobriety, than to bring him, not into the School of a ſober Ethnick Philoſopher, but into a grave Aſſembly of the moſt memorable Biſhops and Doctors of the School of Chriſt. To whom certainly ſo much a greater Reverence and reſpect is due, by how much their Doctor and Maſter Chriſt, is greater than* Xenocrates's *Maſter and Doctor* Plato. *I deſire now my conceited Calviniſt, that thou wouldſt think it worth thy while, to rye, to look upon ſo many and ſo grave Prelates of the Catholick Church, and imagin them to look as it were upon thee, and mildly and gently to ſay unto thee:* Itane nos fili Juliane, *&c. Is it ſo indeed Son* Stillingfleet, *are we then Idolaters? What anſwer wouldſt thou give them? With what face wouldſt thou look upon them? What arguments would occur to thee? Wouldſt thou*

 date,

dare, wouldst thou have the face to produce such wodden Daggers as thou art ever and anon drawing upon us? Or rather would not such pittiful Weapons fall out of thy hand, at the presence of so great Doctors, and such grave Prelates of Gods Church? Wouldst thou have the forehead to tell the great S. Augustin, *our B. Lord said,* Do this in remembranee of me; the words which I speak unto you are spirit and life, I am a Door, I am a true Vine, *&c.* As if that great Doctor and his venerable Fellows could be ignorant of such petty Cavils as those.

Tautumne apud te, &c. *Can a* Calvin, *or a* Stillingfleet *have so much Authority with any person of sobriety, that he should for their regards, not only forsake so many and so great Doctors and defenders of the Christian Faith, from the rising of the Sun to the going down thereof; but also dare to call them Idolaters and Abettors of damnable Errors? I desire my conceited Calvinist, would but consider into what an Assembly I have brought him. 'Tis an Assembly of Saintly Doctors, not of the popular multitude: Such as were not only Children, but Fathers of the Church; famous in their Generations for Learning and Sanctity, who well furnished with spiritual Weapons, strenuously warred against the Hereticks of their days, and having happily finished the labours of their dispensation, holily went to rest in peace. Nor was the doctrin, we are now disputing, any new devised Opinion of theirs; but what they learnt in the Church of Christ, in the time of their Rudiments, that they taught the Church of Christ in time of their Honors. That which they found in the Church, that they held. That which they received from their Fathers, they delivered to their Children. And if my Calvinist will perhaps say, he does not charge S.* Augustin, *or S.* Chrysostom *with the crime of Idolatry, he must give me leave to tell him, nor then does he justly charge us, whom he sees in the same cause to have followed their steps. But if he will only reproach us with such a Calumny, nor for any other reason, but because we think concerning the holy Eucharist what they thought, hold what they held, preach what they preacht; who does not see that he openly reviles us only, but secretly has the like judgement of them? For what they believe, we believe; what they teach, we teach, yield to them, and you yield to us; acquiess in their sentiments, and you'l cease to condemn ours. Moreover this grave Assembly of antient Doctors, to whom we appeal, then judged concerning this our cause, when nobody could say they had favor or ill will for either party. They had neither friendship nor enmity with you or us. We did not as yet appeal with you to them as Judges, and our*

This we do, & yet we condemn you, because you do not, tho' you say you do.

cause

cauſe was decided by them. Neither you nor we were known to them, and we recite their ſentence given for us againſt you. We did not yet conteſt with you, and they pronouncing ſentences for us, we have overcome you. Or will my Calviniſt have the impudence to accuſe (as ſome do) theſe grave Doctors of blindneſs? A multitude of blind men forſooth avails nothing to find out the Truth! and theſe were the errors and miſtakes of thoſe learned Prelates. What an Age are we fal'n into? Truth muſt be called error, and error truth, light darkneſs, and darkneſs light. S. Auguſtin, S. Ambroſe, S. Cryſoſtom, S. Hierom are blind, but Calvin and Stillingfleet ſee.

Theſe Doctors I have called a Council of, were perſons of ſuch Learning and Sanctity, that if a Synod of Biſhops were gathered out of the whole world, it would be much if ſo many, and ſuch Doctors could be found to ſit in it. Neither indeed were theſe all at one time, but God Almighty as pleaſes him, and as he judges to be expedient, ſcatters a few more excellent and faithful diſpenſers of his myſteries, in ſeveral Ages, and diſtances of places. By ſuch Planters, Waterers, Builders, Paſtors, nurſing Fathers after the Apoſtles, the holy Church has encreaſed. Now what an imprudence, and what an impudence muſt it be for any to preſume to accuſe of the horrible crime of Idolatry, ſo many holy, egregious, and memorable Doctors of the Catholick Verity, and moreover together with them the whole Church of Chriſt; to which divine Family they faithfully Miniſtring ſpiritual Food, flouriſhed with great glory in our Lord. Nay further, they who dare to oppoſe the manifeſt Sentiment, not of ſo many Platonical, Ariſtotelical or Zenonical Doctors, but of ſo many Saints and illuſtrious Prelates in the Church of God, and theſe ſome of them ſingularly endowed with human litterature, and all of them eminently learned in the Sacred Letters, have reaſon not ſo much to fear them, as him who made them profitable Veſſels to himſelf. Theſe Judges, by how much the more deſirable they ought to be unto thee, if thou didſt hold the Catholick Faith, by ſo much thou haſt more reaſon to fear them, becauſe thou oppoſeſt the Catholick Faith, which they miniſtred to little and great, and manifeſtly and ſtoutly defended againſt its Enemies, yea againſt you, then not as yet born. For not only when they lived did they by their words, but alſo by their writings which they left to Poſterity, did they ſtrenuouſly defend the Catholick Faith, that they might break in pieces your Arguments. Hitherto S. *Auguſtin. l. 1. et. 2. Contra Julianum.* I thought fit to adjoyn this Reflexion of S. *Auguſtin*, though ſuperabundant to the force of my Argument, it being ſufficient for my purpoſe to

prove that the doctrin of the Real presence was generally believed in the Primitive Centuries of Christianity, and so much evidently follows from the Authorities above cited. For though some may be so self-conceited as to confess that S. *Ambrose*, S. *Chrysostom*, and the rest of the holy Fathers, Greek and Latin, believed the doctrin of the Real presence, but they with humble submission deemed it to be an Idolatrous and damnable doctrin: yet few I think but have so much regard for those Primitive Doctors, as to allow them so much judgement, as to know what was the belief of their several Churches in their daies, and so much fidelity as to write the Truth as to this particular, which is sufficient for the purport of my discourse. Unless you can think that these holy Fathers were of one Faith, and their several Flocks, who reverenced them as Saints, of another.

What is his meaning here?

An Answer to an Objection.

But you will say, if there be such a miraculous change wrought in the bread and wine in the holy Eucharist, why does it not appear to our senses, as well as other miraculous works of our Lord Jesus did? When he turn'd water into wine, it appeared such to the sight and taste of the Guests at the Marriage-Feast. He did not barely tell them, the water was turn'd into wine, and exact their belief of his word, contrary to the evidence of all their senses, but convinced them that it was so by their very senses. Why then in our present case, if he turn wine into his blood, does it not appear to our sight to be blood? But barely to tell us, that it is his blood, and yet to let it taste and appear as it did; how is this credible? How is it not contrary to one, but to all the Miracles that ever he wrought? And this Argument is further strengthned, for that it would hence follow, we might call in question the whole mystery of Christianity. For we therefore believing in our Lord Jesus, as one indeed sent from God, to teach us nothing but Truth, because of his Miracles, and we having no assurance of his Miracles but from our senses, if our senses may be mistaken, how can we tell but those who were eye-witnesses of his wonders were illuded: and water, for example, was not turned by him into wine, but only seemed wine to the taste and sight of those which were present, and indeed remained water as before. For why may not water remain water, and yet seem to my taste wine, as well as wine be changed into blood, and yet seem to my taste and sight to remain wine?

For Answer to this Objection, we must distinguish two sorts of Mira-

Miracles, with the ends for which they are wrought. Some Miracles are wrought by Almighty God, to draw the world to the Christian Faith; and these must necessarily be the object of our senses; else it could not reasonably be expected, they should work their intended effect in them for whose sakes they are wrought. For example; If any one will by Miracle prove he is sent from God, by raising a dead man to life, or by turning water into wine; he must make it evident to my senses, that the man who was dead is alive, and the water now wine, and not barely tell me so. Else he will be derided as an Impostor and impudent Lyer, instead of being admired and received as a Messenger from Heaven, and Oracle of Truth. There are other Miracles which are wrought by the Almighty, not as a motive to induce us to receive the true Faith, but to sanctifie us when we have received it, or for the necessity of working the salvation of the world. Such are the Miracles of the Incarnation of the Son of God, and all the spiritual effects wrought in the souls of Christians by any of the Sacraments. Now these miraculous effects are not the object of our senses, nor is there any reason they should be. For the Church of Christ does not urge these to perswade Unbelievers to acknowledge the true Faith; but only professes, that by these her members are sanctified. For example; we say by Baptism as an outward and visible sign, is wrought an invisible grace in the soul of the person Baptized. Though view the Child as much as you please, you can by none of your senses perceive any mutation to be wrought. In like manner the Church professes to believe the mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God: that our Lord Jesus, though to outward appearance a mere man, was also true God, and yet by no sense was the Hypostatical Union of his soul and body to the Second person of the blessed Trinity, discernable. This was no doubt a great Miracle, yea the miracle of miracles wrought amongst us; but the end of its working, being not by it as a motive to draw the world to Christianity, but to constitute a fit person for the working of the salvation of the world, it was not necessary it should be the object of our senses. The same Lord and Saviour telling us that he was God, though we could discern no Characters of Divinity in him by any of our senses, he saying that he was God, & proving by other Miracles to our senses, that he was sent from God to teach us nothing but Truth; this was sufficient to secure our belief of his Deity. In like manner, in the mystery of the holy Eucharist, this miraculous change being not wrought, to allure Strangers to the Christian Faith,

Those are Mysteries not Miracles.

Mystery visible.

No Change was either wrought or designed.

How he gives y Institution of y Lrs Supper a wrong turn, quite overlooking the Intent of it, viz. to keep up y Remembrance of his death & Passion & not to change them.

Faith, but to ſanctifie Believers, and to work all thoſe ſpiritual effects in them above-mentioned, by being received by them, and offered up in their preſence for them, *&c.* it was not requiſite this change ſhould be the object of our ſenſes. Nay it was neceſſary it ſhould not be the object of our ſenſes. For it being wrought to the intent we ſhould eat and drink our dear Lord his body and blood, it was neceſſary only the ſubſtance of bread and wine, ſhould be turned into the ſubſtance of our Lords fleſh and blood, the accidents of bread and wine remaining; for that otherwiſe we ſhould have a horror to eat raw fleſh, and drink true appearing blood.

As to the confirmation of the Argument, that hence it would follow we cannot truſt our ſenſes, and conſequently not be certain of any miracle wrought by our Saviour. To this I Anſwer; We may alwaies truſt our ſenſes about their own objects, and in due circumſtances, and when we have not poſitive grounds to think, either God Almighty by himſelf, or by an Angel, or permiſſively by a Devil, repreſents things otherwiſe than they are. The three Children in the fiery Furnace, might really think themſelves in the midſt of ſcorching Flames, though they felt them not, becauſe they had reaſon to ſurmiſe God Almighty wrought a miracle; out of thoſe circumſtances they had no reaſon to believe any thing to be ordinary fire, which ſhould not burn as fire. Nor muſt they for this, for ever after be in doubt, whether they were not environed with Flames of fire or no. Nor muſt *Abram*, becauſe once in a particular circumſtance he miſtook three Angels for three men; therefore never after believe his eyes, whether he ſaw a man or no, unleſs he firſt pinched him by the arm, and felt that he had fleſh and blood as himſelf. Nor muſt one who in the preſence of a Conjurer had taken pibble ſtones for grapes, for ever after be doubtful whether he ſaw grapes or no, till he taſted them. Nor does it follow, S. *Mary Magdalen* could not be certain ſhe ever ſaw our B. Saviour, becauſe once her ſenſes were miſtaken concerning him, taking him for the Gardener. And in our preſent caſe, our B. Saviour telling us that the Holy Euchariſt is his body, we have all reaſon to think that by miracle he makes it to be ſo, whatſoever it ſeems to our ſenſes. Nor do Catholicks therefore, out of ſuch a circumſtance, doubt of all the bread they ſee, whether it be not their Lords body or no? Though I muſt tell you, even here your ſenſes are not miſtaken; for they do perceive what they ſeem to perceive; that is the Accidents of bread and wine, which remain and affect them in the ſame manner,

This overturns all he has been contending for, for if only Accidents are diſcernable by our Senſes, how can we know or ſay that any thing is changed, ſince we always ſee y ſame things?

manner, as when the ſubſtance under them, was the ſubſtance of bread and wine, but now is the ſubſtance of our Lords body and blood. Subſtances are not diſcernable by any ſenſe; only we conclude by a Phyſical certitude, ſuch a ſubſtance is under ſuch a complex of Accidents, when we have not poſitive grounds that God Almighty works a miracle, as here we have; he ſaying expreſly of this object before us, 'Tis his body, and 'tis his blood.

But if there be ſo much to be ſaid for this great myſtery, how comes it to paſs ſo many have ſo great difficulty to believe it? It is not becauſe the myſtery is not highly credible, but it is partly from Nature and partly from Education, and partly from want of a ſerious and frequent conſideration of thoſe Arguments which ſtrongly evince the credibility of it, and partly for want of ſtrange deſires of the happineſs of the other life, and of a heart void of inordinate affections to the things of this life, Pleaſures, Riches, and Honors. 'Tis partly from Nature I ſay. For 'tis not more difficult to our ſenſes to practice Sobriety, Temperance, Chaſtity and Faſting, than it is to our underſtanding to aſſent to Truths which ſeem to ſhock our reaſon and ſenſes, though propoſed by never ſo great Authority. Should you have ſeen our B. Saviour ſucking his Mothers Breaſt in the Stable of *Bethlehem*, whoſoever ſhould have told you, the little Infant there was God Almighty, the maker of Heaven and Earth, Nature would have found a great difficulty to believe ſo ſtrange an aſſertion, and no leſs than it does now to believe that a little Wafer in the hands of a Prieſt, is the ſame Chriſt both God and man, veiled under the appearance of the common accidents of bread. But had it been moreover from your infancy continually noyſed in your ears, by ſuch as you reverenced for their learning and skill in divine matters, that it was impoſſible for God to become man; this would ſtrangely have encreaſed your difficulty to believe a little Infant, in nothing different as to outward appearance from other Children, ſhould be God. But if to all this you ſhould add, never or very ſeldom, and ſlightly to conſider the poſitive Arguments for the belief of that myſtery of the Incarnation, but were ever ſtill poring upon the difficulty, and unlikelineſs and ſeeming impoſſibility of any ſuch thing, 'tis not poſſible you ſhould ever come to the belief of it, though the myſtery be never ſo true in it ſelf, nor the Arguments to prove it, never ſo evident and cogent. But this is the caſe of us generally in *England*, as to the myſtery of the B. Sacrament, and therefore no vvonder if generally it be not believed by us.

Tis nothing more so difficult.

The Case is as different as is God & Man, Spirit & Body, Heavenly & earthly Things.

us: but we rather wonder at their ſtupidity and fond credulity, who can believe any ſuch thing.

We have Gods Word for theſe Things

But to get a right, ſtrong and well-grounded Faith concerning this high myſtery, what muſt we do? Firſt Reflect we are Chriſtians, and as ſuch muſt neceſſarily believe very many ſtrange things, unleſs we will renounce Chriſtianity. For example; we muſt believe that there are three diſtinct Perſons, and every one of theſe is God; and yet there are not three Gods, but only one God. We muſt alſo believe this one God is infinitly merciful, and yet he will permit millions of ſouls to lament and howl amidſt ſcorching Flames for ever, though with a word he could eaſe them of all their pains. Moreover we muſt believe that 1600. years ago, one of the three divine Perſons was incarnat, and became a true mortal man, fleſh and blood as we are; and after 33. years, which he lived upon our Earth, he was nailed to a Croſs, Hands and Feet, till he died; and after three daies came to life again, and after 40. days aſcended into Heaven, where he remains to this day. Theſe would ſeem ſtrange things to believe, to one that ſhould never have heard them before; and yet ſtranger to one, that from his Childhood ſhould have been taught to laugh at ſuch ſtories as mere Fables and idle fictions of cheating Prieſts, who knew them well enough to be ſuch; but for their own gain and intereſt ſeem'd to believe them, and with a great deal of Confidence, taught them for infallible Truths to the credulous multitude. Which being ſo, Reflect 2dly. No Chriſtian muſt bogle at any thing as to the belief of it, merely for the ſtrangeneſs of it, and ſeeming unlikelineſs to his ſenſes or reaſon. But muſt conſider what grounds he has to judge the ſtrange myſtery he is required to believe, was taught his Fore-fathers by our B. Saviour and his Apoſtles; and if he find he has good grounds for this, he muſt immediately ſubmit his underſtanding, and believe it. 3dly. Let us reflect upon the ſtate of our own Country, as it is at preſent, and as our Annals repreſent it to have been ever ſince our firſt Receiving of the Chriſtian Faith. At preſent we have a conſiderable number of Families who believe Tranſubſtantiation, and have believed it from their Fore-fathers time out of mind, and they ſay ever ſince the firſt planting of the Chriſtian Faith amongſt us. We have alſo far greater multitudes who do not believe it, but yet ſo as there's ſcarce one who is fifty years old, whoſe great Grand-father did not believe it, but when his great Grand-father, or his great Grand-fathers Anceſters began to believe it, we are able to give no account. Moreover

Such is Tranſub:

Right

over two hundred years ago, in all the ſeveral Shires or Provinces of *England* we all univerſally, Biſhops, Prieſts, and People, Rich and Poor, Learned and Unlearned believed it: And this not as a new Doctrin found out by themſelves by reading the holy Scriptures. No. They were Enemies to all Novelties, and profeſſed they muſt hold faſt what had been taught by their Fore-elders, and interpret Scripture in the ſenſe their Fore-elders had done. Now how is it poſſible they ſhould come to believe ſuch a ſtrange Doctrin, unleſs it had been taught them from their Fore-fathers, and the firſt Preachers of Chriſtianity in our Nation? Eſpecially they not reading the holy Scriptures as we do now, nor having ſuch ſtore of Bibles, that they might perhaps by their private reading have come to believe this hard and high myſtery contrary to what had been taught them by their Fore-elders. How came they to learn it then? Did they ſome ſtrange morning or other, all awake of a different belief from what they had been of the Evening before? Or did it come into ſome Schollars head by ſtudying the holy Scriptures; reading for example thoſe words, This is my body, ſo often repeated in the Evangeliſts & S. *Paul*; and he hereupon was convinced they had all been in an Error for ſo many years, and by Preaching and Diſputing perſwaded others? But how comes it to paſs then, we having had Hiſtorians that have mentioned far leſs Matters, yet ſay not a word of any ſuch thing? Or did the *Britons* before S. *Auſtin* the Monk, believe no ſuch thing? How came they then not to claſh about it, or if they did, how comes it to paſs other differences are recorded and this is omitted? Beſides if S. *Auſtin* taught it our Anceſters, he confirm'd the Religion he taught by miracles, as all our Stories teſtifie. And alſo he lived within the firſt 600 years, to which Dr. *N. N.* in one of his Sermons appeals: Nor did that bleſſed man pretend to teach us a new Religion neither, newly found out at *Rome*, but what was alwaies believed ever ſince S. *Peter*.

If they had, they would never have believed it, for as ſoon as it was known to be known, this Doctrine was called in Queſtion.

Hiſtorians tell us enough of the Craft of the Popiſh Clergy.

Lying Wonders.

4. Let us conſider why we are Chriſtians, and we ſhall find if we be ſo rationally and groundedly, and not merely becauſe we were ſo brought up from our Childhood: I ſay we ſhall find our Faith to be grounded upon ſuch principles, as if we be true to them, they will force us as ſtrongly to believe Tranſubſtantiation as the Incarnation, the Real preſence as the Deity of our Saviour. For example, I believe the man Jeſus Chriſt, who lived 1600. years ago, was alſo God. And why? Becauſe he ſaid he was ſo, and proved by evident miracles that he was ſent to teach the World Truth, and nothing but Truth.

This very bold Aſſertion ought to be very clearly proved.

And why all this? Becauſe it could not ſtand with the providence of God, to ſuffer a Deceiver to work ſuch miracles as he wrought, teaching withal, and practiſing ſuch ſanctity as he did. For then the moſt ſincere deſirers to know the Truth would be moſt ſubject to miſs of it. But how do I know Jeſus Chriſt wrought ſuch miracles? Becauſe I find them Recorded in certain Books, which ſeveral Nations all over the World, have immemorially looked upon as faithful & true ſtories, ever ſince the time the miracles are ſaid to have been wrought. Now 'tis not poſſible but the men then alive muſt needs certainly know whether he did work ſuch ſtrange miracles or no. And if they had known no ſuch thing was wrought by him, but that theſe things were at firſt feigned by ſome of his Friends, and afterwards committed to writing by them, they could never contrary to the evidence of their own knovvledge, have told unanimouſly ſuch notorious Lyes to their Poſterity, and have made them believe them as they did. Nor could have recommended the Books vvherein they vvere Recorded to their Children, and have made them reverence them as unqueſtionable and infallibly certain Hiſtories, as they did. But hovv do I knovv that Jeſus Chriſt taught that he vvas God? vvhy certainly the Apoſtles underſtood him vvhat he ſaid concerning himſelf; vvhether he vvere only a holy man like to their great *Moyſes*, or elſe vvere true and ſubſtantially God, and conſequently to be Worſhipped by them as ſuch. And no doubt but they taught their firſt Converts vvhat they had learnt from their Maſter Jeſus as to this point, and their Converts their Children till *Arrius*; the Church being till then under Perſecution, and conſequently cannot be ſuppoſed all that vvhile ſo notoriouſly to have changed their Faith, they vvere every day in danger to dye for. Now finding the vvhole Chriſtian World in the belief of the Divinity of our Saviour, and Worſhipping him as God, and this immemorially from their Fore-fathers, and as they profeſſed from the Apoſtles. So as *Arrius* never vvent about to evince them, that ſuch or ſuch a Doctor in ſuch an Age ſince the Apoſtles, had brought in the nevv Doctrin of our Lords Divinity: and finding him alſo called God in the Holy Scriptures, and vvhole Nations of Chriſtians immemorially underſtanding them in a proper, literal ſenſe, and not only in the ſenſe vvhich Kings and Princes are called God; notvvithſtanding all *Arrius* his reaſons drawn from the Impoſſibility of the thing, or from Scriptures underſtood by him after a nevv manner; I conclude my Saviour vvas true God. In like manner no doubt but our B. Savi-

It is not proper to say he taught ye Eucharist, but he instituted & ordained Signs, & they knew his Intent in ym.

our

viour taught his Apostles concerning the holy Eucharist, whether it was only a sign of his body, or else his true body, and consequently to be adored and worshipt by them or no. And no doubt but they taught their first Converts what they had learnt from their Master concerning this mystery, and these their Posterity the same for the first 300. years of the Churches Persecution. Now finding whole Christian Countrys in the time of *Berengarius*, about the year one thousand und fifty, unanimously believing the holy Eucharist to be our Lords true body, and adoring it as such, and this as they professed immemorially from their Ancesters, from the Apostles, and *Berengarius* never undertaking to show, when or how this strange belief was wrought in the Christian Church, nor finding any beginning of it in any Ecclesiastical History of any one Country; and finding it also called so expresly over and over our Lords body, and whole Countrys understanding those sacred Texts in a proper sense, and not one Christian Province understanding them otherwise; for all *Berengarius* his Arguments, drawn as he pretended from the impossibility of the thing, or from Scriptures by him interpreted after a new manner, the wont of all misbelievers, I conclude it is our Lords true body.

He never taught this.

How could they help it? being so keep in Ignorance of ye SS.

This was ye oldest & true Way.

5. Let us consider impartially the testimony of the present Church in communion with the See of *Rome*, which averrs the Holy Eucharist to be our B. Saviours true body. Travel in your thoughts, all over *Europe*, *Asia*, *Africa*, and *America*, and view well the vast multitudes of Roman Catholicks in the present Age, and by the confession of our Adversaries in the ten last Ages. Take notice of their circumstances, of Learning, Study, Vertue, Meditation, Retiredness from all secular encumbrances, as to vast multitudes of them; the prodigies of Sanctity, we profess to have appeared amongst us in several Ages, like the extraordinary Prophets of old amongst the Jews, to awaken drowsie souls: Our *Bennets*, *Bernards*, *Cuthberts*, *Bedes*, *Dominicks*, *Francis's*, *Ignatius's*, &c. The miracles we undoubtedly believe in every Century since the Apostles; yea, in this very Age wrought amongst us. For which we have such Records, as you have no way to evade, but by saying they are forged, without any further proof then your own uncharitable surmise. Records of such wonders, so publick and notorious, as had they been false, the Ages wherein they are said to have been wrought, could not be ignorant of it, and consequently could not unanimously have told their Posterity such notorious Lyes, nor have

Ask your Fellow whether you are a Thief.

Holy Cheats.

And if they are, we are they good for?

I wonder at his insisting on these things, which his Brethren are generally ashamed of.

have recommended the Books to them, wherein they are recounted as true stories. Consider moreover how this numerous Congregation professes her self to be the Mistriss of Truth, the Light of the World, fitly for this end dispersed in all Countrys throughout all Ages, with indefatigable Industry scattering the rayes of the Gospel by her Missionants throughout the whole Earth, fearing no encounter, but challenging the whole world to dispute of what they will, and as long as they will, of the most strange Articles of her Faith. And then think, if it could not stand with the providence of the all good God, to permit one single person, our Lord Jesus, for three or four years in one small Country, to Alarum the World with stupendious miracles and doctrins of Sanctity, unless he had been indeed a true Teacher: Consider I say, how it can stand with the providence of the same all good God, to permit a Congregation made up of so many thousands, for so many Ages, so universally spread over the Earth, accompanied with no less wonders, if any credit can be given to such human testimony as never yet fail'd concerning matters of Fact; if all this while this Congregation teaches damnable Idolatry, and is the greatest Cheat that ever appear'd in the World, and yet that the Divine providence should work nothing like miracles or singular and over-topping Sanctity, in those who pretend to be raised up by him extraordinarily, to discover to the deceived World this grand Imposture. How can this stand with the Almightys desire, that the World should not mistake the true Religion?

O rare Boaster.

If Success be a true Rule, then ye Turks may plead it.

In confirmation of what I have said above, I add these considerations. 1. Let but any one take the pains to look into modern or antient Writers of Ecclesiastical History (which he may do in a little time, and without any great labor, by looking in the Index the word *Eucharistia*, or some such head) and he shall find, that whensoever there has been any dispute concerning this mystery, some one or few opposed it, and all the rest of the Country stood up in defence of it, as of a doctrin they had immemorially been taught by their Ancestors. An evident conviction, that the antient Faith of that Country was, that indeed the Holy Eucharist was our B. Saviours body and blood, and the denial of this mystery was a Novelty. For example, let him consult Ecclesiastical Historiographers, what happen'd about the year one thousand and fifty, and he shall find that one Berengarius, Arch-deacon of the Church of *Angiers* oppugned this mystery, but not as a new doctrin then endeavored by some Bishop or other to be imposed upon the people, but as then generally

In a Time of such Ignorance one Man might have more learning than a whole Country.

But as a false one

rally believed; a clear sign that his own Opinion was a new Error, and the common Faith of the Country was the antient Christian verity. Now let him in the whole History of the Catholick Church, Greek and Latin, find me but one instance in any one Christian Country, on the contrary, and I'le yield him the cause. That is, any one Doctor, Bishop, or Priest, that about such a year of our Lord, in such a Country, began to Preach the mystery of the real presence, upon pretence of clear Scripture for it, or other Arguments, and that he was opposed by the whole Country, as a Teacher of a new strange doctrin they had never heard of before: or else that upon such a Doctors appearing they presently yielded to the force of his Reasons and Arguments, and relinquished their former antient Faith. Which notwithstanding certainly must have happen'd, not only in one, but in all Christian Countries, were the doctrin of the Real presence a new invention, and the denial of it the antient Christian Faith. Else how came all Christendom, according to the confession of our Adversaries for many Ages universally to believe it? Now can any one imagin, that the belief of so strange a mystery, and which in practice makes all the Believers of it Idolaters, unless it be true; could be introduced both into the Greek and Latin Church, without any opposition, or if it were opposed, that no one Writer in any one Country, should make mention who they were that opposed it, and how they lost their cause? And this, though there have not wanted Writers of what has happen'd in the Christian Church, who have made mention of far lesser accidents, in any Age wherein this belief can be pretended to have been brought in; nay, which have taken notice in several Ages and Countries, how certain deniers of this mystery have attempted the bringing in of their new doctrin, & by whom they were opposed, and how they were silenced. Read our own Chronicles about the year 1370. concerning *John Wiclef*, and see whether he was not opposed by all the Bishops and Priests of our English Church as a teacher of a doctrin contrary to what they had been taught by their Ancestors, when he began to teach our Lord's body was not in the Eucharist? And then reflect with your self, if the doctrin of the Real presence was not taught our Nation, when we were first converted to Christianity, how comes it to pass that all our Chronicles should be silent, when or by whom we were taught this mysterious doctrin, and what assistance they had from the civil power, so universally to impose upon our Country such a strange belief; which in all reason requires a far grea-

There is no Necessity of its so happening; for damnable Heresies are generally privily brought in by little & little: & this tending to the Honour of Mother Church, no Wonder if it were brought about by all ye Art imaginable.

No wonder, when none but Monks were Writers.

So were Paul & Silas by Demetrius & Craftsmen.

greater power to make it prevail then the contrary doctrin. And yet you see where the contrary doctrin is believed, it cost no small pains and force, and time to introduce it, nor has all this neither been able to make it Universal, in so much as in one Christian Province. Make the like Reflexion upon the City of *Rome*, and consider that in the Apostles daies they believed aright concerning this great mystery, and for some hundreds of years according to the concession of our Adversaries. Now this great and Cultivated City, has memorials of what has past in it, as we have of what has past in *London*, and yet they make no mention of any one that ever began since their first Conversion to Christianity, to teach this strange doctrin and worship of the holy Eucharist, but that they have immemorially from S. *Peter* believed and adored it, as the body of their Saviour and God. Nor indeed can it be imagin'd how they could ever possibly change their first Faith, having ever opposed all Teachers of Novelties, with that Answer of S. *Stephen* Pope to the Clergy of *Africa*, concerning Rebaptization (never heeding all their seeming Reasons, or Texts of Scripture understood after a new manner, as S. *Vincent Lirinensis* observes) *Nihil novandum nisi quod traditum est*: We must innovate nothing, but stick to the doctrin delivered to us by our Ancestors. When think you should we in *London* be brought universally to believe the Real presence, if we were resolved for ever tenaciously to adhere to the doctrin taught us by our immediat Predecessors, notwithstanding whatsoever Argument should be brought against us from Reason or Scripture?

It had been well if this Rule had never been broken.

2. Consider how our Adversaries would triumph over us, could they find but one City in the whole world, which should profess to have believed immemorially, since their first Reception of the Christian Faith, as they do concerning the Holy Eucharist, and all their Cronicles were either silent, or positively testified as much, and we were not able positively to shew when they began their Faith, but should Answer: their Chronicles were corrupted, or antient Records lost, or by little and little they left off imperceptibly believing as they were first taught. But if to all this they could produce in several Ages, how such a Doctor upon pretence of cleer Scripture, endeavor'd to make them leave their antient Faith, but they still retained it, opposing to all his seeming strong Arguments, that thus they had been taught time out of mind by their Ancestors, from their first Conversion to Christian Religion, and to understand those Scriptures otherwise. But if to all this, they could produce in several

Ages

Ages Recorded miracles in confirmation of their Faith, and we should have nothing to reply but that these miracles were feigned. Think if they would not return upon us, that such wild Answers open'd a way to Atheists to deny all the miracles of *Moyses* and our B. Saviour. And then consider impartially whether this be not our Case. *It is to be feared, your pretending so much to miracles has made many Atheists, & brought Religion into Contempt.*

3. Consider though our Adversaries but very irrationally deny any miracles to have been wrought in our Church, yet they cannot deny but we have Records without number of notorious and most evident miracles, and such Records as in civil matters no body questions. Men, for example, of good judgment and honest repute attesting upon their Oaths, that upon such a day, such and such miraculous events happen'd, & they were eye-witnesses of them, *&c.* And then reflect how it can stand with the providence of God and his desire of mankinds worshipping him according to his will, to permit even such Records of miracles in a false Church. For certainly a sincere desirer to find out the Truth, must needs be strangely enclin'd to give credit to such Records, and which moreover he should find to be credited by persons of as good judgment and integrity as himself in all Christian Provinces in Communion with the See of *Rome*. And indeed such Records of false miracles would be as apt to deceive impartial judicious Enquirers, as even the sight of false miracles themselves. For why are we so assured our senses cannot deceive us? Is it not because we never experienced them to fail us in due circumstances? and also because if we should be necessitated by them to judge of things otherwise than they are, God Almighty, who has so made our senses, would be the cause of our mistake, which were to tell a real lye? And did Tradition duely circumstantiated, ever yet fail? And would not God Almighties providence in the government of man-kind be deficient, (it being necessary for us to know certainly not only things that are present to us, which we do by our senses; but also things that are distant from us both in place and time, which we can only know by the report of others) if no assured certain credit could be given to the testimony of men, though never so many in number, and of never so good repute? Especially when he obliges us to be of a Religion which was taught our Ancestors 1600. years before we were Born, and yet we can give no assured credit to History or immemorial testimonies of whole Countrys? Moreover, we finding by the experience of the Age we live in, that though fabulous stories be told and printed too, yet we easily

God hates all Iniquity, & yet not for it abroad.

Consider this well your self.

easily distinguish betwixt them and true Histories of the present times. For that true Histories gain an universal credit amongst persons of the best understanding, and the Historigraphers that write them, are commended to Posterity as faithful witnesses of Truth; whereas fables and fictions, every one of ordinary capacity, looks upon them as such, nor do we give any other Recommendation of them to Posterity than as of fabulous Romances. This we experiencing in the present Age, persons of humility and solid judgment, deem the like to have happen'd in the daies of their Fore-fathers; and consequently give another kind of credit to Stories, how strange so ever recounted by a S. *Bernard*, a venerable *Bede*, or a S. *Bonaventure*, than they do to the fictions of a *Don Quixot*, & *Guy* of *Warwick*, &c. And he that will consult what has happen'd in the World, will find mens eyes and other senses to have been as often mistaken, as he will find whole Towns and Countries to have confidently told a Lye to their Posterity, which they evidently knew to be a Lye.

Do we not find in Histories different Relations of ye same Fact? is there no such thing as a partial Writer?

And this the Atheists of our days would do well to reflect on, when they so senseleslly call in question the History of *Moyses* or Book of *Exodus*, concerning the wonders wrought by Almighty God in *Egypt*. And Dr. *N. N.* too, must one day give a sad account for all his Drollery, as merry as he makes himself with the History of *Lorretto*, and other stories registred by persons of noted sanctity and integrity. And would he reflect a little on the difficulty of making whole Countrys believe a Lye, contrary to the evidence of their senses; he would find it a greater miracle that the whole Territory of *Lorretto* should so immemorially believe so great a Lye, as he would make his Reader think they do, than the wonder it self he sacrilegiously scoffs at: To wit, the Translation of the House, in which our B. Lord was conceived by his Holy Mother at *Nazareth*, out of the Holy Land, first into *Dalmatia*, and then afterwards into *Italy*. Let the Dr. cause a house to be built in a Night, in S. *James*'s Park, and then tell the Citizens of *London*, it was brought thither by Angels out of a forreign Country, and see if he can make them so universally to believe it, as they shall, no body contradicting, make their Posterity believe as much; and I perswade my self he may with the same ease, bring such a House from *Geneva* or *New-England* in a Night, as make the numerous multitude believe such a notorious Lye.

O *England, England,* dear Native Soyl, at length open thine Eyes, and acknowledge the illimited goodneſs of the divine Majeſty to be ſuch, that not contenting himſelf with giving us prodigies of Sanctity for the firſt Planters of Chriſtianity, and with confirming their ſublime and holy doctrins with evident ſigns and wonders, he is ever now and then awakening the drowſie world with a S. *Dominick*, a S. *Francis*, or a S. *Xauerius*, and ceaſes not by undeniable miracles to confirm the languiſhing Faith of tepid Chriſtians. The ſight of preſent miracles ſtrangely ſtrengthens our Faith of wonders paſt and done long ſince. And believe it, 'tis a next diſpoſition to Antichriſtianiſm and Atheiſm, freely to give our ſelves the liberty to ſcoff at all miracles, though atteſted by never ſo grave Authors, except ſuch as are recorded in the four Goſpels: and to laugh at all lives of Chriſtian Saints as ridiculous, but thoſe of the twelve Apoſtles; though to an impartial conſiderer, one Egg does not more reſemble another, than do the perſons we ſo freely deride, expreſs the firſt followers of our dear Redeemer, in their holy and divine Converſations.

4. Conſider the force of S. *Auſtins* Argument to prove the truth of Chriſtianity. The world has actually ſubmitted to Chriſtianity, as to a Religion taught from Heaven. From whence the Saint argues thus. The world believed the high myſterious doctrins of Chriſtianity, either upon miracles wrought by the firſt teachers of them, or without miracles. If upon miracles, then you who doubt have reaſon alſo to believe them. Or if the world ſubmitted their Faith to believe ſuch ſtrange myſteries, without any miracles, this is the greateſt miracle of all, that ſuch vaſt multitudes, and innumerable of theſe, of ripe judgement and quick underſtanding, ſhould believe ſuch ſtrange things upon the Authority of the Propoſer without a miracle. Apply this to our preſent myſtery. Two hundred years ago the whole Chriſtian world believed the H. Euchariſt to be our B. Saviours body, and adored it as ſuch. Hereupon I argue. Theſe vaſt multitudes, and many of them of great learning and judgement, began to believe this ſtrange myſtery, either for miracles wrought by the firſt Teachers of it, or without miracles. If upon miracles then you ought to believe it alſo: If without miracles, this is the greateſt miracle of all that ſuch vaſt multitudes, and theſe innumerable of them, well cultivated with learning, beſides their natural ripeneſs of judgment, and ſharpneſs of wit, ſhould believe ſo ſtrange a myſtery, without any miracles wrought by thoſe who firſt demanded their belief of it.

Look it upon Truſt, if you will, not daring to diſpute it, or any thing elſe.

And consider how many have been butchered by papists for not believing it.

Finally consider with your self how many millions there are who believe this myſtery, and would ſooner part with their life than their Faith of it; and theſe, if you have the leaſt grain of humility, ſuch, as you have reaſon to think them of as good Learning, Wit, and Judgment as your ſelf: Add, as good Chriſtians as your ſelf, for either piety to God, or Charity to their indigent Neighbor, or mortification to themſelves. Imagin you ſaw all theſe, as holy and as wiſe as your ſelf in the ſeveral Chriſtian Countrys of the whole world, all upon their knees, adoring a ſeeming Wafer-Cake, as their Creator and God; Biſhops, Prieſts, Doctors of Divinity in vaſt numbers, Kings and Princes, Men and Women of all degrees and condition. And can you now think, all theſe people to be in their wits, and not have ſome ſtrong Reaſons and Arguments which induce them to ſuch a Faith and ſuch a practice? Had you and I been in the Stable of *Bethlehem* in the Night of our Lord's Nativity, and S. *Joſeph* ſhould have told us that the little Infant we ſaw there ſucking his Mothers Breaſt, was the Maker of Heaven and Earth; we ſhould no doubt have found great difficulty to believe him. But ſhould we have ſtaied there a while, and have ſeen the Shepherds come in, and fall down upon their knees before him, by the admonition as they pretended of an Angel that had appeared to them, as they were keeping watch over their Flocks; this doubtleſs would a little have enclined us to think, that at leaſt there was ſomething extraordinary in the new born Babe. But had we ſtaied till the comeing of the three Kings, and ſeen them in like manner fall down before him, making him rich preſents upon the admonition, as they ſaid, of a miraculous Star which had appeared to them in their own Country; ſuch circumſtances as theſe, would ſure have ſtrangely urged us to the belief of that wonder of wonders. And to make uſe of a homebred example. Who would have taken our Gracious Soverain *Charles* the Second, for the King of *Great Brittain*, *France*, and *Ireland*, that ſhould have ſeen him under the diſguiſe of a Sheepherd, Sea-man, or other habit he was forced to aſſume, to ſecure his Royal Perſon? But could you and I have peeped into this private Chamber, and ſeen his ſmall Retinue all bare before him, and ſome one of them upon his knees preſenting him with a cup of Beer or wine; ſhould we not think you have begun to ſuſpect: Surely this Perſon, however and for whatſoever reaſons he may diſguiſe himſelf, is of another quality than his outward garb repreſents him to be? Nor do I leſs perſwade my ſelf, did you and I ſee the many

thou-

thouſands all over the world, as well of the *Grecian* as *Roman* Church, who upon their knees with an aſſured Faith, devoutly adore a Conſecrated Wafer as their Creator and God, if we have any reſpect to reaſon and man-kind, and do not imagin all the world to be Fools except our ſelves: Such a proſpect as this, would make us ſuſpect in the ſecret of our hearts: Surely under this diſguiſe of a contemptible Wafer, there is veiled ſome hidden Majeſty or other, who forces the higheſt adoration from ſuch vaſt multitudes of all Nations, and many of them ſo ſharp-witted, and of ſuch ſolid judgements, and ſuch impartial enquirers after Truth, and of ſo good and holy lives. Say then, and we have reaſon to ſay it heartily, and without the leaſt ſcruple or doubt. 'Twas the ſame our Gracious Soverain, who lay hid in a common Oak at *White-Ladys*, under the diſguiſe of a Peaſants weed, who ſits now at *Weſtminſter* in his Princely Throne inveſted in his Royal Robes. And 'tis the ſame Chriſt Jeſus our only Saviour and God, who under the humble diſguiſe of common bread and wine, is immolated here below every day upon our Chriſtian Altars, who in tranſcendent ſplendor and glory, ſits at the right hand of his Eternal Father in the Heavens. *Sir*, I have done my part, the Almighty do the reſt, and make you a happy Child of his holy Church. But *Sir*, I beſeech you give me leave to add

I ſhould think them juſt as wiſe as thoſe who worſhip Onions, or any thing elſe that they think fit to call their Gods.

A Poſtſcript to my Fellow-Collegians.

My deareſt Companions, whom with my ſoul I wiſh the ſame happineſs with my ſelf, both in this Life and the other. I beſeech you, before you be engaged in the world, and hindred from an induſtrious impartial enquiry after Truth, by the cares of a Family, and fears of wanting a competent ſubſiſtance, do your ſelves and your Country that right, as to conſider with as little paſſion and prejudice as you can, theſe my ſcattered thoughts; and do not raſhly conclude againſt Tranſubſtantiation until you have fully heard what its Aſſertors, as well as what its Deniers have to ſay for themſelves. I was once as you are, and many ſuſpicions of the truth of the Roman Catholick Faith came into my mind, but ſtill I was hindred from examining of it, with this one thought: If I turn Papiſt, I muſt believe Tranſubſtantiation, but I know that's an impoſſibility, and this made me ſit down contented with the Religion in which I was educated. But afterwards making it my buſineſs more in good earneſt to ſave my ſoul, and ſetting my ſelf impartially to examin what was the be-

lief of the Primitive times concerning this myſtery, and finding moſt clear Teſtimonies for the Real preſence in the moſt renowned Primitive Chriſtian Doctors, I was much amazed, having been always taught they were of a contrary Faith. I read the citations to a Clergy-man of my Acquaintance, I demand of him what he thought their belief was, who in thoſe words expreſſed their Faith? He told me, no doubt but they believed as the Church of *Rome* believes. I conſult the Authors themſelves, read the context before and after the ſaid citations, I am ſtill more and more convinced, S. *Auguſtin*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Cyril*, &c. believed as the Church of *Rome* now believes. Hereupon I reſolve not to venture my ſoul upon a point of Philoſophy, for example, whether God Almighty by all his Omnipotency can make a body be in two places at once or no? I believe two myſteries already, both which puzzle and ſhock my reaſon as much as Tranſubſtantiation, to wit, the B. Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God, why may not I believe a third as well; eſpecially when I have the ſame Arguments for one as the other: clear Scriptures, the immemorial belief of all Nations ever ſince the Apoſtles, &c. And indeed, if God Almighty will oblige me to believe what was taught ſixteen hundred years before I was born, how ſhould he expect I ſhould come to the knowledge of this, but by ſuch books as were written in thoſe times, and near thoſe times, and by the teſtimony of all Chriſtian Countrys what has been immemorially believed by them ever ſince they were Chriſtians? Now if it be too long a journey to go over all Chriſtendom, to ask of them, what is, and what alwaies has been their Faith as to Tranſubſtantiation, and how they have always underſtood the holy Scriptures that ſpeak of that myſtery go but to the *Royal Exchange* in *London*, and there you may meet with perſons, which at leaſt have been in all or moſt Chriſtian Countrys, and ask of them what the belief and practice of Chriſtendom is, and you will find they all believe and adore the B. Sacrament, and have done ſo, as they ſay, immemorially ever ſince they were Chriſtians, as Roman-Catholicks do in *England*; or elſe if they do for ſome numbers amongſt them believe and practice otherwiſe, 'tis only ſince ſuch a time above, &c. And then reflect how by ſuch an Argument you prove, as you think, efficaciouſly againſt an Antiſcripturiſt, that the Books of the Old and New Teſtament are infallible, and you ſecurely believe every particular Story in them, though never ſo ſtrange; in like manner the change of *Saturday*-Sabbath into *Sunday*, againſt the Sabbatarians; and Faſting in Lent as Apoſtolical

[illegible] Theſe are not Objects of Reaſon, as being Matters of pure Revelation: whereas your Tranſub: is of things adequate to o' Reaſon.

with

with Biſhop *Gunning* againſt Non-Conformiſts. And indeed it is impoſſible ſuch an univerſal effect ſhould ever be without a proportionate univerſal cauſe. That ſo many ſeveral Chriſtian Countrys ſhould immemorially abſtain from certain meats on *Fridays* every week, and in Lent every year, or adore a Conſecrated piece of Bread as their Creator and God, unleſs they had been either firſt taught ſo to do by the firſt Planters of Chriſtianity; or by ſome Preachers ſince; or had agreed ſo to do in ſome General Council by their repreſentatives, is impoſſible. Should we ever think you, even in the ſingle City of *London*, have fall'n by little and little to have ſhut up our ſhops, on the Anniverſary of the death of our gracious Soverain *Charles* the Firſt, unleſs we had been commanded ſo to do by ſome Univerſal Authority, Eccleſiaſtical or Civil? Take notice, by this Argument is alſo proved all other points of Catholick practice, or Faith, as Purgatory, prayer for the Dead, *&c.* but eſpecially ſuch as nature has a difficulty to believe or do. That one man ſhould kill himſelf is no wonder, but that all the Inhabitants of a populous City ſhould kill themſelves, would be ſuch a wonder as never yet happen'd in Nature.

that we allow.

And lack's Notice By y Argument y Catholicks might impoſe their Idolatry.

Againſt all that has been ſaid, I doubt not but you will be apt to reply. We acknowledge for divers Ages, our own and other Chriſtian Countrys believed the holy Euchariſt to be really and ſubſtantially our B. Saviours true body & blood, & adored it as ſuch, but yet we cannot believe that either S. *Peter* and *Paul* at *Rome*, or S. *Joſeph* of *Arimathia* in our own Country taught any ſuch doctrin, but that imperceptibly by little and little the whole Chriſtian world changed the Faith that was firſt planted by the Apoſtles, as particular men grow gray, and whole Countries change their Languages imperceptibly. For Anſwer to this Reply, let us not diſcourſe in generals, but conſider and deviſe with our ſelves how poſſibly ſuch a thing might practically happen. For example, let us take the City of *Rome* into our conſideration. Its confeſſed by all, that the Inhabitants of that Cultivated City, Prieſts and People univerſally do believe, and have for many generations believed, a Conſecrated Wafer to be Jeſus Chriſt, God and Man, veiled with the outward appearance or ſpecies of common Bread: Now we are to enquire, how they came to this ſtrange Faith? Say then; *Rome* by little and little began to believe this myſtery, firſt one and then another, till at length the whole City was of that belief. But how? without a Teacher, and all in the ſame year, or in what length of time? That one man, or ſome

And why not?

The Clergy found their Account in it by y Authority & Credit they aſſumed to y^ſelves thereby, raiſing Wonder in ye ignorant deluded Vulgar, taking y^m to be more y^n Men & could make God.

ſome few in a populous City, ſhould of themſelves fall to the belief of ſuch a ſtrange myſtery, contrary to what has been believed by their Anceſtors, might be granted; but that the whole City Learned and Unlearned, Prieſt and People, ſhould ſo change their Faith, and that for ſuch a ſtrange one too, without a Maſter or a Teacher, thats wholly incredible: Or if ſome Biſhop or Prieſt of *Rome* ſince the Apoſtles, had perſwaded the people to believe the ſtrange doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, how comes it to paſs, ſeeing the belief of the doctrin is ſtill retained, that the Authors name is not retained with ſingular honor and reverence by the believers of it, as the names of *Calvin* and *Luther* are by Calviniſts and Lutherans; and the names of the firſt Preachers of Chriſtianity by the ſeveral Chriſtian Countrys they converted? Beſides, whoſoever Prieſt or Layman ſhould have begun to preach ſuch a ſtrange and incredible doctrin to nature, muſt needs have met with great oppoſition from all ſorts of perſons; from good men, becauſe his doctrin tended to make them all groſs Idolaters, and Worſhippers of a piece of Bread as God; from bad men, becauſe his doctrin ſtrangely ſhocked their ſenſe and reaſon, which nature and vitious followers of nature would by no means endure. Now if oppoſition were made at the firſt introducing of this new Faith, how comes it to paſs, all, both Roman and other Hiſtories are ſilent as to any ſuch thing? *They are not.*

Oppoſition was frequently made.

Should I by way of Propheſie tell you, that the great City of *London*, within theſe 300. years, ſhall as univerſally, as does now the City of *Rome* believe and adore the Holy Euchariſt as Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, and this ſo imperceptibly, that neither they, nor neighbouring Citys or Countrys ſhall perceive it, till the whole City be quite changed: Nay 300. years hence, when they ſhall be charged with Idolatry and Innovation for ſuch their belief and practice, they ſhall profeſs that they have always ſo believed and practiſed ever ſince they were Chriſtians. And all this, though they ſhall for theſe 300. years have Prieſts and Biſhops, whoſe Office it ſhall be to teach the quite contrary doctrin, and theſe Prieſts ſhall be ſuch Zealous retainers of the doctrin they now believe, that when in the compaſs of this 300. years to come, there ſhall riſe up Teachers of new Doctrins, deniers of the Divinity of our Saviour, and the eternity of the torments of impenitent Sinners, *&c.* and ſhall alledge ſtrong human Reaſons and ſeeming Scriptures for themſelves, theſe Prieſts ſhall oppoſe, we muſt innovate nothing, we muſt ſtick to the belief our Anceſtors were of in the year 1675. Then God Almighty teſtified from

from Heaven, by evident Miracles, the Truth of our Fore-elders Faith, and then we had charge not to change our Faith, though an Angel from Heaven ſhould accuſe us of miſtake, and therefore you muſt pardon us if we adhere to this Faith. Add. There ſhall not want frequent Aſſemblies of the wiſeſt and beſt Learned in the City, and they ſhall meet on purpoſe to enquire whether the faith and practice of the year 1675. be kept, and yet they ſhall never take notice of ſo groſs and notorious a change, as the believing and adoring a piece of bread as God, till the whole City be in ſuch a belief and practice, but other miſtakes that ſome particular men were bringing in, they ſhall obſerve and correct. Nay 300. years hence, there ſhall riſe up a certain Prieſt, who ſhall accuſe all the Prieſts and people of the City for believing otherwiſe than their Anceſtors did in 1675. but yet ſhall not be able by vertue of any Hiſtory or Oral Tradition, to ſhew how, or by whom they were perſwaded to that ſtrange Faith they ſhall then be of; and yet there ſhall not want Hiſtoriographers neither, who ſhall take notice of other notorious changes that ſhall happen both in Church and State in thoſe 300. years.

Think now ſeriouſly with your ſelves, how impoſſible it is for any ſuch thing to happen in nature, and examin impartially whether the deniers of Tranſubſtantiation be not forced to affirm the like incredible wonder to have happen'd not in one City alone, but in many Cities and whole Countrys. But the wonder would be yet greater, if there were not one Believer of Tranſubſtantiation in the year 1675. in the City of *London*, nor never had been one ſince the firſt planting of Chriſtianity, neither there, nor in any other neighbouring City or Country: and yet all this muſt be ſolved by deniers of Tranſubſtantiation to be Apoſtolical doctrin. For, place your ſelf in what Age of Chriſtianity you pleaſe, and ſuppoſe the known Cities and Countries of Chriſtendom to believe univerſally concerning the holy Euchariſt as the Citizens of *London* generally do now. Take for example the year 500. after our B. Lord (though our Adverſaries pretend to be willing to be judged by the Doctors of the firſt 600.) Add to 500. a decurſion of 300. or 500. years; and then ſee what Faith the Chriſtian world is of; and you'l find they univerſally believe and adore the Holy Euchariſt as *Rome* does at this preſent. Joyn now your ſelves with *Berengarius* in the year one thouſand and fifty or thereabouts, and ſee what account you can give, how all your fellow Clergy and Laity came ſo to have changed

and

and altered their Faith from what it was in the fifth Century? For you must not think the several Councils gathered against that denier of the Real presence, the Bishops in them, then first began to believe the Real presence, and that when they returned to their several Dioceſſes they taught them a ſtrange new doctrin, which they by inſpiration had newly learnt when they were Aſſembled together; but they only gave in their Verdicts what immemorially had been believed in their ſeveral Countrys they came from, as to that myſtery. As if, for example, a Synod of all the Biſhops in *England* ſhould meet in the year 1675. to examin concerning the Quakers, whether they Preached falſe and Antichriſtian doctrin or no, in denying Baptiſm and all other Sacraments; and they ſhould conclude againſt thoſe Innovators; would you infer thence, the Church of *England* only in the year 1675. and never before, reverenced Baptiſm or any other Sacrament of Chriſt? And yet this is juſt our caſe, when our Adverſaries will have the belief and adoration of the B. Sacrament to have not been heard of before the Councils that condemned *Berengarius*.

As to your inſtances of a man growing gray, and whole Countrys imperceptibly changing their language; is it poſſible think you for any mans whole head by little and little to grow gray, and neither he nor any other ſhould take notice of it, till he were as white as Snow, and this, though he and others were charged to take notice of every hair that ſhould grow gray, and to pluck it out immediatly, and he and others ſhould frequently conſult whether any ſuch change were made in his head or no? Say the ſame concerning a whole Countrys changing their Language by little and little. Impoſe a ſevere penalty againſt any one that in writing or ſpeech ſhould introduce a new word, and appoint Officers to take notice of all ſuch new coyned words, and let theſe Officers have frequent conſults to this purpoſe. Add a menace of death both to Overſeers and people, if any ſuch alteration through their neglect of their duty ſhould happen: And then think how it could be poſſible for a whole Country by little and little imperceptibly to change its Language? The like change and menace gave Jeſus Chriſt to the Paſtors of his Church not to change their Faith. And yet after all this can not one Country, but the whole Chriſtian world have ſo changed their Faith, as they became imperceptibly moſt ſtupid Idolaters? To conclude, if you examin the matter well, you will find, you muſt either reſolve to believe the ſtrange doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, or elſe ſomething far more incredible. *Nothing is more incredible.*

Soli Chriſto Gloria.

And well if Hope ſhould fail us.

One may aſk ye Author, in way of firſt Worſhipper of Bread, &c.